

VOLUME XIX
In Two Sections

MAY, 1933

NUMBER 5
Section One

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION
EMERGENCY FELLOWSHIPS
TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: JOSEPH ALLEN; PAUL KAUFMAN;
JOSEPH MAYER; H. W. TYLER, *Chairman*.

Publication Office: 20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

Editorial Office: 744 JACKSON PLACE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September.

Entered as Second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at
Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL NOTE.....	298
NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS	
Council Meeting.....	299
Summer School for Engineering Teachers.....	300
General Education Board, Annual Report for 1931-32.....	300
Rhodes Scholarships.....	301
American Field Service Fellowships for French Universities.....	302
Academic Conditions in Germany.....	302
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE	
Texas Technological College.....	303
St. Lawrence University, Committee A Statement.....	307
ACADEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT	
Emergency Fellowships.....	309
EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION	
Coordination of Higher Education.....	312
Responsibility of the Teacher in the Present Crisis, <i>John Dewey</i>	318
REVIEWS	
The College Library, <i>William M. Randall</i>	320
Medical Education.....	321
LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES	
University of Illinois, Tariff Decision.....	326
Tulane University, Faculty Group Insurance.....	326
Resolutions from Chapters.....	328
Health and Hospital Service.....	328
COMMUNICATIONS	
A Case of Tenure.....	329
Appreciation of the Appointment Service.....	329
MEMBERSHIP	
Members Elected.....	330
Nominations for Membership.....	332

APPOINTMENT SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vacancies Reported.....	334
Teachers Available.....	334

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

EDITORIAL NOTE

The present *Bulletin* appears in two parts on account of the desirability of independent use of the extended and important report of the Committee on College and University Teaching. It is hoped that this report will be scrutinized during the summer, with a view to discussion at chapter meetings in the fall and at the annual meeting in December. Particular mention may also be made of the two reports on academic freedom and tenure, which, however, represent only a small fraction of the activities of the committee during the spring.

The article on academic unemployment and emergency fellowships represents a continuation of the effort of the Committee on the Economic Condition of the Profession and the Washington Office to contribute in a measure to the relief of unemployed members. Communications were addressed to chapters early in May, but academic conditions at this season are not always favorable to prompt attention. It is hoped that individual members may interest themselves in the plan proposed and communicate with the chairman of the committee, Professor S. H. Slichter, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, or with the Washington Office.

The office will be open throughout the summer, one of the Secretaries being in attendance or within easy access.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

COUNCIL MEETING

A meeting of the Council, attended by fifteen members, was held at the Washington Office, Saturday, April 22.

It was voted to make inquiry of chapters as to the suggested discontinuance of the chapter rebate, with the expectation that the consequent saving would facilitate the holding of subsidized delegate meetings.

Information presented by the officers indicated receipts and expenses approximately corresponding with the estimates made at the annual meeting in December.

While the number of resignations has shown some increase and the number of nominations a decline, the net membership at this date is more than 200 larger than the corresponding total in 1932. Resignations have been tabulated by institutions and by reasons indicated. Letters of inquiry have been sent to chapter officers in institutions where the resignations were relatively numerous.

The President announced the appointment of Professors Ella Lonn, Goucher; Richard Owens, George Washington; and W. O. Weyforth, Johns Hopkins, as a committee to examine the organization and management of the Washington Office, with a view to advising the Committee on Policy and Plans or the Council on questions of economy and efficiency. The Council will hold a meeting in the early fall for consideration of recommendations by these committees.

The determination of the place and date of the next annual meeting is deferred, pending the indication of preference by chapters.

On recommendation of the Committee on The Economic Condition of the Profession, the Council approved a plan for attempting the establishment of emergency fellowships, with a view to assisting junior members of the profession who may otherwise be diverted from it. For further details see page 309.

Battle Creek College was provisionally restored to the eligible list.

Communications in regard to various matters of policy received from the Iowa State chapter and a letter addressed by the Pittsburgh chapter to other chapters were referred to the Committee on Policy with a view to further discussion by the Council at a meeting in the early fall.

Committee Appointment

Professor F. K. Richtmyer has accepted the Chairmanship of the Committee on the Encouragement of University Research.

SUMMER SCHOOL FOR ENGINEERING TEACHERS

The Summer School for Engineering Teachers, an enterprise which was established by the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education in 1927, is to devote its session of 1933 to the teaching of mining and metallurgical engineering. The School will be held at the University of Wisconsin, with Professor Richard S. McCaffrey, Head of the Department of Mining and Metallurgy, of that institution, as the Director of the session, and Professor Ben Elliott, of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, of the same institution, as the Secretary.

The program of the session has been arranged in two principal divisions—Part I, comprising topics of interest to all teachers of this general division of engineering education, and Part II, dealing with topics of particular interest to the two groups of teachers concerned: (a) teachers of mining engineering proper, including such special sub-divisions as petroleum engineering, economic geology, and the like, and (b) teachers of the various divisions of metallurgical engineering. This arrangement of the program is intended to accord with the diverse character of the subject matter, included in the two principal divisions of mining and metallurgical curricula.

Since the establishment of the Summer School in 1927, over 1000 teachers have been attracted to its sessions. The plan that has been followed in the operation of the Summer School is the holding of sessions in successive years at various institutions throughout the country, and devoted in turn to the various principal divisions of engineering study. Previous sessions have been devoted to engineering mechanics, physics, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, civil engineering, mathematics, chemical engineering, engineering drawing and descriptive geometry, economics, and English. The session of 1933 will complete a cycle that was contemplated when the school was begun, which was intended to cover, over a period of years, all of the recognized major divisions of engineering education.

Professor H. P. Hammond, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, is General Director of the School.

GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD, ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1931-32

Action taken by the Board this year provides that the income of each future gift shall be used for a period of ten years for the specific purpose for which the gift was made; that thereafter the income may be used for any other purpose or purposes, related as closely as possible to the original purpose, that may prove desirable; and that after a lapse of fifty years the principal also may be expended.

In connection with the action cited above, the report mentions that in 1925 and subsequent years the Board notified universities that the conditions with respect to full-time staffs imposed by its gifts for their medical schools need not, as far as the Board is concerned, be adhered to in the future if, in the judgment of the authorities of the university, educational and scientific progress would be better served by a change in the plan of organization.

Appropriations described in the report include a grant to the California Institute of Technology for the construction of a 200-inch reflecting telescope; to the University of Chicago for upwards of \$2,000,000 for its Oriental Institute; to the University of North Carolina for the systematic accumulation of certain bibliographical material, \$30,000; the International Institute of Teachers Colleges, whose ten-year grant from the International Education Board expires in 1933, \$150,000, payable over a five-year period; the Stevens Institute of Technology, for researches in the development and application of tests to determine the aptitude of students for the engineering profession, \$10,000; Tulane University, for its medical school, \$45,000; Vanderbilt University, for the purpose of books and journals for the medical library, \$50,000, to be paid over a period of four years; University of Florida, toward the cost of building and equipping a practice high school, \$150,000; and smaller grants to the University of South Carolina and George Peabody College for Teachers; for the study of state institutions of higher education in Georgia, \$20,000; the Library of Atlanta University, an endowment of \$600,000; Fisk University, \$75,000.

RHODES SCHOLARSHIPS

For the present year a competition will be held in all of the states, which are divided into eight districts. Each state committee may nominate two men to appear before the district committee. From the twelve candidates each committee will select four. Thus a state may receive two scholarships or none, according to the merits of its candidates.

The new regulations now permit a scholar to postpone his third year, returning to Oxford after a period of work in the United States, or, in a special case, to spend his third year in postgraduate work in some other university in Great Britain or on the continent of Europe.

Applications are due not later than November 18, 1933. Elections will be held January 2, 4, and 6, 1934. Scholars then elected will enter Oxford in October, 1934.

The 1933 memorandum of regulations, with application blank attached, may be obtained from the president of any college or university,

or from President Frank Aydelotte, American Secretary to the Rhodes Trustees, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. Questions concerning details will be answered by secretaries of state committees of selection, whose names are printed on the reverse side of the application blank.

AMERICAN FIELD SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS FOR FRENCH UNIVERSITIES

A Bulletin under date of April 1 reviews the list of the field service fellows, of whom 137 have studied in France for periods of one year or longer since 1919. They are now located in all sections of the United States and in some foreign countries. Incidental mention is made in a letter from one of the recent fellows of the full occupation of the American House of the *Cité Universitaire* by over 200 students, of whom 50 are French. The *Cité* appears rather distant from the center of activities, but is only fifteen minutes by bus from the Latin quarter. Properly kept rooms, facilities for bathing, and adequate heating are features of comfort sometimes lacking in pensions. The distribution by subjects naturally shows the largest number, 24, in romance languages and literature; 15 are grouped under political science and international law; 12 under history; 11 under English language and literature.

ACADEMIC CONDITIONS IN GERMANY

The following resolution has been adopted by the Council:

The American Association of University Professors is deeply concerned with the maintenance of those fundamental principles of academic freedom and tenure, without which university work of the highest quality can not be permanently sustained.

The Council of the Association has become reluctantly convinced that in certain European countries and notably in Germany, so long and so honorably distinguished for its particular emphasis on *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*, these high principles have been sacrificed and subordinated to political and other considerations ulterior if not irrelevant to true scientific research and scholarship.

The Council has no wish to express any opinion on the political life or ideals of any nation, but science and scholarship have long since become international, and the conditions of intellectual life in every important country are a matter of legitimate concern to every other. It is, therefore, resolved that this expression of the conviction of the Council and of its profound sympathy for members of the profession who have been subjected to intolerant treatment in these difficult times be published in the *Bulletin* of the Association and communicated to the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE

On June 17, 1932, the Board of Directors of Texas Technological College (Lubbock, Texas) "failed to renew" the contracts of eighteen members of the faculty, and placed four others on a part-time basis. Of the vacancies thus created, five were subsequently filled at lower salaries. For this action, taken without warning to the faculty, no reasons were given.

A committee composed of Professors W. R. Arthur (University of Colorado), D. Y. Thomas (University of Arkansas), and Howard O. Eaton (University of Oklahoma), Chairman, has investigated for the Association the serious condition of affairs thus created. The committee's investigation was impeded by the firm refusal of the Board of Directors to cooperate or give information. It was also hampered by the atmosphere of uneasiness and timidity prevailing at the institution. Despite these handicaps, the members of the committee interviewed a large number of persons at Lubbock and elsewhere, and obtained further information by correspondence. In fairness to Dr. Bradford Knapp, who became President of Texas Technological College on September 1, 1932, it should be added that he rendered the committee all assistance which was consistent with the obstructive attitude of his Board. The committee has filed an elaborate report at the headquarters of the Association in Washington. Since this document is too long to print verbatim, it is summarized with brief comment below:

Texas Technological College was opened in 1925. It rapidly became an institution of considerable size. The citizens of Lubbock regarded it with great pride and took a lively interest in its affairs.

Early in February, 1932, the pastor of the largest Baptist Church in Lubbock asserted that¹ "there is a group (of professors) in Tech who delight in airing their skepticism, doubts, atheism, and infidelity in classrooms and in conferences. Among these is the head of a certain department who, from all reports, is undermining the faith of students and leaving them wandering and groping in the dark." The charge was taken up by a Fort Worth pastor whose fundamentalist activities have long been notorious. In a radio address, the charge was broadcast together with the assertion that two flags were challenging all civilization, "first, the red flag of Sovietism and second, the black flag of atheism." Similar charges emanated from other sources. The Fort Worth pastor followed up his accusations by seeking to have each faculty member answer a questionnaire supposed to elicit evidence of doctrinal

¹ *The Fundamentalist*, March 11, 1932.

abnormalities. As a result of its investigations, the committee finds that the college is situated in a community where the dominant political and economic attitude is conservative and the religious belief is based on fundamentalism. Four of the members of the Board of Directors are directly connected with public utilities.

President Horn appears to have acted coolly and discreetly. He avoided the questionnaire, making instead a personal investigation with the assistance of the accusing local pastor. They were unable to find any reasonable grounds for the charges. The President counseled calmness and academic detachment on the part of the faculty.

On April 13, 1932, President Horn died, and his steadying influence was thus removed. The immediate administration of the college passed into the hands of the so-called Council of Deans, which was incompetent in its lack of leadership. What the investigating committee describes as a period of administrative anarchy followed, when the deans seemed to feel at liberty to give free play to their personal desires and animosities. During this time a group of the Board of Directors conducted an inquiry into several college activities, including the Y. W. C. A. and particularly the League for Industrial Democracy. Also during this period, the college was faced with the necessity of reshaping its activities to meet a budget cut of approximately ten per cent.

There was in force at the institution a system of informal annual contracts. A number of faculty members with confidence in the permanency of their tenure had bought substantial homes. To them the action of the Board on June 17, 1932, was a stunning surprise. Taking advantage of the annual contract situation, the Board has again and again put forward the familiar quibble that no "dismissals" occurred. This is a futile play upon words. On any hypothesis, the Board's action was unnecessarily late and grossly violated the rules of tenure which the Association advocates.

More or less officially, the explanation has been circulated that reduction in the faculty was necessitated by economy. The investigating committee does not credit this explanation because it finds no evidence that adequate consideration was given to the possibility of a horizontal cut in salaries, additional to the five per cent cut already in force, or to adjustments in any other items of expenditure. The committee further finds in at least three cases evidence of personal animosities between the deans and the members of their faculties who were dismissed.

As a specific illustration, the investigating committee examined with particular care the case of Dr. John C. Granbery, who had been Head of the Department of History ever since the college opened. Professor Granbery was in the midst of an amicable discussion with his Dean respecting the necessary decrease in expenses. Apparently this dis-

cussion was leading toward a reasonable horizontal percentage cut when the Board of Directors terminated Dr. Granbery's tenure without any request for such action from the Dean. Dr. Granbery promptly applied for a specification of reasons and a hearing. The latter was granted on July 2, 1932, but, since the reasons for dismissal were withheld, the hearing was a brief and empty formality. Substantial evidence before the investigating committee indicated that Dr. Granbery was dropped because he was believed to be an economic liberal, because he made speeches, and because he wrote articles. There was no showing of impropriety in his utterances or writings. The committee found no evidence reflecting upon his capability as a teacher, and concluded that his dismissal was not only a violation of reasonable minimum standards of tenure, but also of decent standards of academic freedom. In particular, the committee found that "economy" was an insufficient reason for thus dismissing a head of a department.

During the investigation Clifford B. Jones, Chairman of the Board of Directors, wrote the investigating committee that "those who are interested in the welfare of this institution will accept the well known probity and integrity of purpose of our new President, Dr. Bradford Knapp, and the officials of this College as a guarantee of ethical procedure." Another Board member stated to the committee that the Board's policy in the future would be to follow the recommendations of President Knapp, provided they could be met within the budget. President Knapp on November 30, 1932, wrote the investigating committee a letter in which he emphasized the financial emergency and his lack of responsibility for the Board's action on June 17, 1932, and added:

"Regarding the subject of academic tenure, I am very glad to outline the policies of the institution, which will be endorsed by the Board of Directors and the endorsement forwarded to you as soon as the Board or the Executive Committee of the Board can have a meeting. These policies, I can state as follows:

"(1) The precise terms and expectations of every appointment will be stated in writing and be in possession of both the college and the teacher.

"(2) Every new appointment will be for a probationary period where it is not made for a definite period. In case the employee is continued after the probationary period or definite period of employment, a new and definite arrangement will be made. And, after the probationary or definite period, the employment will be regarded as permanent, subject only to the contingency that the Legislature of the State either fails to make appropriations or definitely discontinues the line of work in which the employee is engaged. In this case, notice of the necessity of discontinuance will be given as far in advance as the circumstances will permit.

"(3) Where a person has been employed for a period beyond probation or beyond a definite period of employment, and the employment is

regarded as more or less permanent, termination will be made only on due and timely notice. Timely notice, we shall consider to be a minimum of three months prior to the ending of the school year, except in case of dismissal for cause, involving moral turpitude, treason, or conduct prejudicial to the best interests of the institution.

"(4) We shall exercise every precaution within our power to maintain here an atmosphere of confidence and the highest possible professional standards. The institution is young. It opened its doors in the fall of 1925. It has yet to find itself and to develop those traditions and that poise and confidence in its future which is the heritage of institutions which have existed for fifty or a hundred years. It can only establish these gradually and by earnest work. The present administration of the institution is quite confident that if the Board of Directors will approve of these general policies men may regard their employment here as having the same security and subject to the same limitations as other standard institutions within this same general area of our country."

To date, no further word has been received from President Knapp, stating that the Board has actually adopted his tenure policies. It is evident that until the Board adopts some definite policies regarding academic freedom and tenure at the Texas Technological College there will be no adequate safeguards at the institution.

This report is a condensation of the original report submitted by the investigating committee, and is approved for publication by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, S. A. Mitchell, *Chairman*.

The condensed text of the foregoing report has been submitted to President Knapp of Texas Technological College. His reply includes the following paragraphs:

"First, it is stated in the report that, 'More or less officially, the explanation has been circulated that the reduction in the faculty was necessitated by economy. The investigating committee does not credit this explanation.' Why, I am unable to understand, because the statement was and is the truth. Not only was there a deficit in its budget the year before, but this other fact is very pertinent: Two general surveys of the State Educational Institutions were in progress, one by the State Board of Education and one by the Joint Legislative Committee on Organization and Economy. Both of these surveys have been published in printed form and both emphasize the matter of economy and heavy cost in the teaching work of this and other institutions of the State. One of the reports recommends the dropping of twenty-nine persons from the faculty of this institution. The facts had been gathered last summer and the Council of Deans in charge of the institution after Dr. Horn's death, and the Board of Directors, knew of the tendency of these surveys to criticize the college. Had not some definite steps been taken to reduce expenses, the college would

have made a poor showing before the Legislature. As time has gone on, the wisdom of reducing the expenses has been more and more apparent, no matter what criticism your committee may have made against the method of accomplishing that purpose. Any fair or full understanding of the position of the institution would have brought out that the statement that economy was necessary was true. The statement made by your committee can be proven so unfair in this regard as to weaken the report.

"Second, in the last part of the report, where reference is made to my statement of policies and the fact that the Board has not passed on the same, is not quite fair also. When I wrote the committee I was expecting to be able to devote much time to establishing this policy, but the reports of these two surveys were published and they demanded immediate and long time attention. Both of them proposed to discontinue three divisions of the school and entirely change its organization and objectives. We had to prepare for a long and hard fight to maintain the institution. Had these reports been adopted, we would have lost a large part of our faculty by law. I am glad to report that it seems now that we have won this hard battle, and that we shall receive a drastic cut in appropriations, but will be able to continue the original organization and objectives of the school. Furthermore, we knew that three new members of the Board were to be appointed and the Board seemed reluctant to deal with anything except this matter of sustaining the school. They have expressed to me personally their agreement with me and I am still confident that they will agree to the policies stated when the new Board is organized."

The closing lines of the report have been changed to accord with the explanation given in the second paragraph quoted above from the President's letter. As to the first quoted paragraph, the report was not intended to convey the idea that no need for economy existed. Instead, it was intended merely as a criticism of a policy which economizes by a number of dismissals rather than by general salary reductions.

ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY, COMMITTEE A STATEMENT

In 1931 the Association received a complaint about the dismissal of a professor from The St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York. It was deemed inadvisable to press the matter because the complaint had been delayed so long that acquiescence by the professor might reasonably be assumed.

In March of the present year a second complaint concerning the same institution was received. On this occasion it appeared that a full professor had been dismissed without a hearing on the strength of a charge by the President that the Professor had lost popularity with the students.

The Professor vigorously denies the truth of this charge, and there is no showing of any adequate presentation of evidence in support of the charge. In response to a letter of inquiry from the General Secretary of the Association, President Sykes wrote:

"Your letter of March 18 relating to Professor — was received and has been carefully considered by me and by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University, of which committee I am a member. It was and is the judgment of this committee whose duty it is to engage members of our faculty and to terminate their services, always taking into consideration the rights of all concerned, that a change in the headship of the — Department was essential. The Board of Trustees ratified the action of the Executive Committee. The matter has therefore been passed upon by the ultimate governing authority of the University."

It seems clear from the foregoing blunt assertion that the administration of The St. Lawrence University maintains the propriety of dismissals without hearings even in the case of full professors.

ACADEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT

EMERGENCY FELLOWSHIPS

Unemployment among university and college teachers has been slow in developing during the depression but is now becoming rapidly worse and during the coming year it will be of great seriousness. Last year reports from 38 of the stronger institutions to the Association showed that staffs were being reduced only from 6482 in 1931-32 to 6271 in 1932-33, or 3.2 per cent. A survey by *Science Service* this spring, covering 25 of the largest and strongest institutions, indicates staff reductions of from 0 to 20 per cent with an average of between 5 and 8 per cent. The average for the country as a whole will undoubtedly be higher. Indeed, with many institutions facing budget reductions of from 25 per cent to 40 per cent, it is evident that there will be few appointments and probably some dropping of junior teachers. Even institutions in such relatively good financial condition that no salary cuts are being made next year are sacrificing junior teachers in order to balance their budgets. Reports from fifteen of the leading graduate schools indicate that, in every instance but two, the outlook for this year's Ph.D.'s is worse than a year ago. Some universities are adopting the policy of giving research fellowships and assistantships to the most meritorious of their Ph.D.'s. Such arrangements, though commendable, shift the problem rather than solve it, for they mean that fellowships and assistantships which would ordinarily go to men in the beginning or the midst of their graduate work are not available for these students.

A year ago the Council passed a resolution urging that junior members should not be sacrificed for the purpose of maintaining the salary scale of the remainder of the staff. With openings far more scarce this year than last, a heavy responsibility rests upon university administrations which maintain salary scales while at the same time dropping junior men. In view of the growing seriousness of the situation, faculty members in institutions which have not had salary reductions or which have had only small reductions (10 or 15 per cent or less) will undoubtedly welcome the opportunity to assist the best of displaced men and of this year's Ph.D.'s to remain in academic work.

The following plan of emergency fellowships for this purpose has received the endorsement of the Council and is being submitted to the chapters. The plan rests on three basic principles: (1) that whatever is done should be done on a local basis and should go to past, present, or prospective students of the institution; (2) that assistance to members of the profession should come first from other members of the profession rather than from the Foundations or other charitable institu-

tions; (3) that assistance should take the form of research fellowships which would enable the recipients to improve their professional training.

In about thirty important universities and colleges no salary cuts or only small salary cuts have occurred or are in prospect. The members of these faculties are a favored group in the depression. A two per cent deduction from salaries would in most instances provide as many emergency fellowships as could be wisely administered. Despite drastic reductions in income, the engineers of New York City raised over \$100,000 a year ago from approximately 3000 members for relief of unemployed engineers. Notable efforts have been made by the architects in Boston, New York, and elsewhere.

EMERGENCY FELLOWSHIPS PLAN

(Plan B)

This plan provides that the research councils, the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, the American Association of University Professors, and possibly the Foundations join in a request directed to each university with an important graduate school (about thirty in all) to include about \$3000 or \$4000 for emergency fellowships in its budget for next year and to organize among its faculty a campaign to raise an equal amount by faculty contributions.

Many of the universities with important graduate schools have either made no salary cuts or only moderate cuts. Consequently, the faculties in these institutions might well be expected to respond generously to an appeal to help graduates of the institution.

If six fellowships were established in each of twenty universities, one hundred and twenty of the best men could be provided for. (If the Foundations were to establish one additional fellowship for every two created by each institution and its faculty members, provision could be made for one hundred eighty men.) It would probably not be necessary in every instance to give as much as \$1000. By creating some fellowships with smaller stipends, more than two hundred men might be given assistance.

Some institutions require holders of fellowships to pay tuition fees. A part of the plan would be that tuition be waived for all holders of emergency fellowships.

Although two hundred fellowships would not be enough, they would provide for a large proportion of the men with most promise. Despite the seriousness of the situation, this is probably all that we can hope to do.

Council Vote

"RESOLVED THAT it is the sense of the Council that the increasing serious employment outlook for this year's doctors of philosophy and for junior faculty members who have recently been released makes desirable carefully planned and concerted action on the part of the universities and bodies interested in the future of the academic profession for the purpose of devising ways and means of giving assistance;

"THAT the Council invites the cooperation of the National Research Council, the Social Science Research Council, the Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education in creating a joint committee for this purpose;

"THAT the Council approves in principle Plan 'B,' submitted by the Committee on The Economic Condition of the Profession, for application wherever drastic salary reductions have not occurred and recommends that in such institutions local committees on the employment of junior members be appointed with authority to solicit funds;

"THAT because graduate schools are compelled to confine their funds for fellowships and assistantships almost entirely to men already on the ground there is an urgent need for assistance to many seniors of real promise who plan an academic career, and chapters in colleges which are not in position to offer facilities for research fellowships and which have not had drastic salary reductions be encouraged to cooperate with college administrations in financing the creation of teaching fellowships or reading assistantships for seniors of unusual promise."

Special letters inviting local cooperation along the lines indicated have been sent to chapter officers in both universities and colleges.

A first meeting of the joint committee was held May 5.

EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The March issue of the *Journal of Higher Education* is devoted to studies of various aspects of coordination in the field of higher education. Extracts from some of the more significant articles are herewith presented.

From the general survey, "An Incomparable Challenge," by S. P. Capen, is quoted the following:

American educational institutions are traditionally autonomous and independent. As in no other country the individual school has been a self-contained unit, provided by the community which it served and responsible only to that community. The amalgamation of all the schools serving a large community into a system with a central administration and a unified policy, to which the undertakings of the individual school are subordinated, is a comparatively recent development. Complete subordination of the institution to the system prevails thus far only in the field of elementary education; the secondary schools still preserve a considerable measure of autonomy.

We commonly speak of state systems of education. The laws recognize and define such systems. The term "state system" is, however, still largely prophetic, rather than descriptive. The directive machinery in most states is quite rudimentary, and the amount of control exercised by the State educational authorities has generally been small. Rarely has it invaded those phases of school policy in which the communities are most vitally interested. Wherever the central state administration has sought to dictate in such matters, its efforts have been resisted. Hence, within a single state system a great variety of practice commonly exists.

The evolution of state educational systems has paralleled the development of American governmental institutions generally, responding to the same impulses. This evolution has been advanced, for example, by the need for services which communities cannot conveniently provide for themselves. It has been retarded by the tradition of local independence. Reforming zeal, on the one hand, and political expediencies, on the other, have promoted or checked it. Waves of propaganda have occasionally warped its direction. As a rule, the increasing costs of education have tended to strengthen the state agencies of administration because of the inability of certain localities to finance their schools. And as state agencies have grown stronger, their authority has gradually spread into areas of school policy once held to be the special preserves of the communities. But on the whole the movement toward the extension of state control has been slow. It has like-

wise been uneven. In respect to their powers, forms of organization, and relations to other branches of the state government, state departments of education present differences as marked as their similarities.

In short, state systems of education represent a haphazard growth. Few of them embody consistent principles covering the distribution of central and local powers and responsibilities. . . .

However imperfect may be the state administrative machinery for dealing with the public schools, it is in most instances far better designed to secure unity of policy and economy of operation than the agencies which govern higher education. Indeed, the conflicts, the wasteful duplications, the indefensible compromises, and the narrow provincialisms that have manifested themselves in the conduct of the higher institutions of many states during the past three decades form an unedifying episode in American educational history. State universities and land-grant colleges under the control of separate boards—and sometimes even under the control of a single board—have fought against one another for legislative appropriations, have duplicated one another's most expensive offerings, have signed periodic treaties of peace favorable to neither and which neither could keep, have sought mere bigness as a leverage for greater support and without reference to state needs for professional and expert services. State universities and land-grant colleges have jointly opposed normal schools and teachers' colleges, have invaded the sphere of professional education for which the latter institutions were established, and have tried to block their expansion to meet the demands of the profession for more extended training. Normal schools and teachers' colleges have wasted their always insufficient resources in building up courses and curriculums in special expensive lines for which the demand was small and often artificially stimulated, have aped the universities and competed with them, have to a degree neglected their primary function in pursuit of a hollow prestige. . . .

Those who are responsible for the administration of higher education within the states have now, therefore, a double reason to favor a closer coordination of the several agencies concerned. It is to their instant advantage that a possible reduction in available funds shall not result in the abandonment or dilution of any vital part of the educational program of the state. In the long run, it is no less to their advantage that the ancient faults in articulation, or the maladjustment of the program to the needs for professional and expert training and for research within the state, should be corrected and that the conflicts should be resolved. Public confidence in the wisdom and integrity of school management will be seriously shaken if these evils are not soon remedied.

There is ground for the belief, however, that the educational pro-

fession as a whole does not yet appreciate the fact that rapid progress in this direction is now imperative. The profession is still too prone to think institutionally. It still thinks of defending some particular school, some custom or prerogative, against jealous rivals. It must learn to think in other terms, in terms of the whole educational enterprise.

The implications of the statements just made are no doubt plain. The coordination of the state agencies of higher education may be effected in one of two ways. It may be forced on the agencies by frightened or indignant legislatures. In that case, the coordinating devices are likely to be tyrannical, unintelligent, disruptive of morale, blind to subtle but indispensable values. Examples of coordinating bodies and officials illustrating all of these characteristics already exist. They are painful to contemplate, but they should serve as a warning to the educational personnel of other states.

The other obvious way to achieve the results desired is through a voluntary alliance of all the agencies of higher education, public and private, within the states for the formulation and execution of coherent and defensible programs; for the creation of a state educational policy. If this way is chosen the limitations on institutional freedom—and limitations are inevitable—will be self-imposed and easier to bear. Enthusiasm born of cooperating in a great cause will be stimulated. Eventual legislative action will but ratify an already accomplished fact.

The experience of the United States in the voluntary organization of educational forces is now extensive. It is unique and precious. It is the outgrowth of our peculiar tradition. It is our tried and tested way at once to preserve our independence and to gain the advantages of unified control. The time has plainly come to extend the process to meet conditions that have but recently developed.

In the discussion of "factors essential to coordination within an institution and between institutions," ex-President W. O. Thompson of Ohio State University makes these statements:

The present financial depression with all its outreachings may provide an excellent opportunity for higher education to inspect itself. The universities have been inspected and surveyed from almost every possible source. If local institutions could now muster up the courage to make a careful survey of what they are doing, of why they are doing it, of the cost of doing it, and of the educational progress under the established program of the institution, there would come a sort of revival of interest in just what the institution is undertaking to accomplish. . . .

Higher education has never submitted itself to the kind of supervision and inspection so common in the public schools. Extreme

individualism has permitted such experience as is just cited. If by some happy coincidence there could be a better coordination of these forces and some cooperation on the part of individual professors, there would be a great release of energy available for different purposes.

There is a suspicion in the minds of many that lack of resourcefulness accounts for this duplication. Professors are even charged with a tendency to follow the line of least resistance. Others say that repetition and line upon line are essentially necessary if we are to familiarize a generation with the knowledge that ought to be the common possession of all educated people. It is claimed that our English brethren go into life after leaving Oxford or Cambridge with a considerable body of information and ideals common to all Oxford graduates. This is believed to be a source of strength to the British Commonwealth. It is noticeable that the universities organized in the provinces appreciate this fact so much as to undertake to follow in the leadership of the older institutions.

Now no such common body of information or ideals would characterize the American alumnus. There might be some of it in the better established portions of our older institutions. It would hardly be claimed, however, to be universal even in the oldest universities of the United States.

The statements just made may intimate a reason for the kind of surveys that have been suggested in this paper. When mention is made of a survey many people think of it in a purely mechanical or statistical manner. It would appear that the greatest need is a survey that would discover the more profound reasons for desiring a greater unity and a better coordination in order that a hearty cooperation in the social order may be possible. . . .

It would seem little less than an intellectual calamity if in the present chaotic condition of the social mind higher education should lack a leadership or fail to make such an inventory of its own resources and methods as the most intelligent people in other circles are making of their affairs. Coordination, to be sure, is not a local or temporary issue only. It has been with us for a long time, and no doubt will continue in residence. The present issue is whether universities will do a little house cleaning and a little reorganization of energy in order to increase their own efficiency. If this can be done without calling upon the government for a subsidy, there might develop a most important educational revival. This revival no doubt would be free from excessive emotionalism but sufficiently charged with energy to give promise of keeping higher education in step with the new progress that is pretty sure to follow the recovery of the country and of the world from their present, temporary experience in the trough of the sea.

Professor W. W. Charters presents a comprehensive picture of coordination of instruction within the single institution, from which these extracts are drawn:

In analyzing the improvements in instruction that are related to problems of coordination I wish first of all to describe five essential tools that are needed in order that coordination may be carried on. Then I shall discuss briefly a few of the problems of coordination in relation to the use of these tools.

The first tool to mention is some instrument which will indicate the facts of supply and demand. Until a few years ago, comparatively few students found their way to college, and every able-bodied college graduate could secure a position in some part of the United States. If he did not like the type of vocation for which he had prepared, he could easily change to another more attractive one. These conditions prevailed in the days when America had a frontier. Now, we are told that the frontier is gone, and that citizens must stay at home and make the best of it. Now, also, we find definite oversupply in many of the professions. Indeed, we found it in some of them prior to 1930. There are too many high school teachers. There is a huge oversupply of nurses. A recent study reports 25,000 doctors in excess of the health needs of the nation. In such situations the social demands for trained service should be carefully canvassed, and the relative supply of trained persons should be ascertained so that the intelligence of the oncoming generation may be turned in directions where it will count for most in social benefits and personal satisfaction. The ideal product of the supply-and-demand instrument would be a prediction of the needs for trained service five or more years in advance. But while we wait for this formula, it is possible to collect a large array of data which will bear upon the problem and enable the state, the institution, and the youth of the state to cooperate in giving to society the service it needs at the points where it needs it most intensely.

A second instrument that contributes to the solution of some of the problems of coordination and instruction is the formulation of objectives. A casual examination of many catalogues of colleges and universities clearly shows that the techniques for deriving and formulating the major objectives have not been thoroughly known nor expertly used by large numbers of our faculties. Yet effective coordination is not possible without a clear picture of what is to be achieved by each department in the total general program. . . .

A third instrument that is needed to control a number of problems in the coordination of instruction is the objective examination of student proficiency. This instrument possesses three characteristics—objectives, measures, and reliability. Adequate examinations require

the formulation of the objectives that the instructors are seeking to achieve—facts, principles, skills, general abilities, and traits of personality. No examination is a trustworthy measure which does not attempt to measure all the objectives sought by the instructor....

A fourth instrument that is needed in large institutions and probably almost to an equal degree in small institutions is a flexible program. Flexibility is needed to permit the student to carry what he is able to master. Ideally, there should be no maximum number of hours per year; the student should be allowed to carry all the work that he can successfully complete. But more difficult to obtain is a schedule sufficiently flexible to allow students to work where they should. For instance, a plan for segregating sixty bright students in freshman chemistry so that they might cover three quarters' work in two had to be discontinued because the schedule-maker was unable to arrange the time of meeting. No one was particularly to blame, but the schedule-making presented problems which seemed too complex for adequate solution. The tragedy was that an excellent plan had to be discarded because the schedule was not flexible enough.

A fifth needed instrument is a collection of techniques for curriculum construction. To be able to set up desired objectives clearly and, having accepted them, to produce a content with maximum quality and logical strictness are ideal. Many courses are logically arranged, but many others are indefinite in content, loose in organization, and poor in quality. Only a small fraction of the teachers are able to produce, on call, outlines of their courses and their references. In few institutions such outlines are available in the central office, where an inquiring teacher of allied or subsequent courses can discover what is being taught in a given course. Hence, arise duplication and a dozen other ills.

With these five instruments available it is possible to proceed to a study of a number of problems of coordination in instruction. The first to mention is the problem of formulation of objectives without which coordination is handicapped....

Second, the duplication of training courses among state institutions can be adequately controlled only by studies of demand and supply. While a state may need only one medical school, it may require five departments of education. While a four-year liberal-arts college may be needed in only one center, the first two years may be needed in all....

Sequence of courses, a form of coordination among courses, is vastly overrated; how much no one knows. One of the factors which militate against the value of sequences in general is careless selection of prerequisites. Students of the same intelligence and experience, some

with and some without the prerequisites, frequently do work of equal merit measured by the standards of the course. Another factor is the intelligence of the student. Our brightest students need to be held to few prerequisites, for in many courses they can acquire the prerequisite knowledge on demand when they need it. . . .

Fortunately, the gifted student needs little attention because he is notably able to take care of himself if the way is cleared for him. Coordination and cooperation are necessary to provide this clearance of passage. . . .

In summing up the several contributions to the subject, the editorial comment observes: The significant fact that flows from these efforts at coordination is this. It is possible and practicable for institutions to coordinate their activities on their own initiative without the application of external force by the legislators. This is particularly well illustrated by the Cleveland project described by President Vinson. Here over a dozen institutions all performing uncoordinated services to the adults of a great city accomplished increasing coordination by the simple device of appointing committees of farseeing men from their own ranks. . . .

This present year is appropriate for the initiation of such conferences. Financial stringency has already made the support of a common cause imperative in some cases. The unrest of legislatures over costs will lead to a vigorous demand for coordination or consolidation as an economy measure. It is much better from every point of view for the institutions to beat the legislatures to consolidation.

Among the articles to be noted are those on efforts toward coordination in a number of states, Montana, New York, Florida, and North Carolina; and a fully documented study of the "Legal Bases for Coordination" by Arthur J. Klein and W. Ray Smittle.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE TEACHER IN THE PRESENT CRISIS¹

Above all, it behooves the teachers in behalf of the community, of the educational function which they serve, and not merely because of their personal interest in a fit wage for what they do—self-respecting and honorable as is that motive—to make clear beyond peradventure that public education is not a business carried on for pecuniary profit, that it is not therefore an occupation to be measured by the standards which the bankers and real estate men and the big industrialists seek for themselves in working for personal gain and measuring success and failure by the ledger balance, but that money spent on education is a social investment—an investment in future well-being, moral,

¹ From an address before the New Haven Teachers' Association, January 29, 1933.

economic, physical, and intellectual, of the country. Teachers are simply means, agents in this social work. They are performing the most important public duty now performed by any one group in society. Any claims which they can rightfully make are not made in behalf of themselves as private persons, but in behalf of society and the nation. These will be what they are and are not in the future largely because of what is done and not done in this day and generation in the schools of the country....

By what method shall teachers make clear to a confused public, a public deliberately misled by powerful agencies, the rightful claims of public schools in this time of crisis? I know of but one basic answer. It is found in the old saying of Benjamin Franklin, "We must hang together or we will all hang separately." Organization, union, combined and concerted thought and action is the answer and the only answer I can see to the adequate solution of the problem of the crisis. There is a militant organization serving as the organ and instrument of this effort already in existence. It is the American Federation of Teachers, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor....

Some teachers have the idea that the sole object of a teachers' union and the American Federation of Teachers is to protect teachers' wages. I have no apologies to make for that phase. I don't see why any workers should not have an organization to secure a decent living standard. The laborer is worthy of his hire. But the foundations of the teachers' unions of the American Federation of Teachers are very much wider and I should like to have you study together the history of unions representing even a minority of teachers, often a small minority, in such cities as Chicago, New York, Minneapolis, Atlanta, and others to see that they have stood in the van of all movements calculated to improve public education, to introduce the principles and ideals of progressive education into the schools attended by the mass of the children; that they have been the most active instrument there is, not merely in protecting teachers from individual abuse, but in standing against the efforts of politicians to use the public school system for their own purposes....

JOHN DEWEY

American Teacher, vol. xvii, No. 4

REVIEWS

THE COLLEGE LIBRARY

The College Library, A Descriptive Study of the Libraries in Four-year Liberal-Arts Colleges in the United States, by William M. Randall; American Library Association and the University of Chicago Press, 1932.

This volume of one hundred and sixty-five pages owes its being to the activities of the Advisory Group on College Libraries of the Carnegie Corporation of which the Chairman is William Warner Bishop, Librarian of the University of Michigan. This group gathered information of two sorts from 205 unnamed American colleges in 45 states: (1) information concerning content of college collections obtained by comparison with the *List of Books for College Libraries* compiled under the direction of Charles B. Shaw, Librarian of Swarthmore College; (2) information concerning buildings, equipment, and administration obtained by means of a questionnaire. Mr. Randall was engaged to visit colleges for the purpose of supplementing by personal inspection the information secured from the questionnaire. This book, therefore, is a presentation of the group's accumulation of information of the second sort.

The questionnaire, that first resort of the academic mind, is a frequent contributor to what Mr. Justice Holmes so delightfully termed "delusive exactness." The reason is that as yet we have no standard terminology in education. For statistical purposes we have not agreed upon a definition of "a student." Yet we gaily compare the enrolment of one institution which counts every person who enrolls for one or more courses even if he drops out at the end of three weeks with that of another institution which counts only those students who are registered for full work and who complete the work of the term. Likewise comparisons are made among libraries which sometimes count titles, sometimes volumes, sometimes books, sometimes pamphlets bound or unbound; and also among library expenditures although one can not be sure without careful inquiry if "library expenditures" include only expenditures for books or provide also for salaries of librarians and assistants and possibly janitors of the library building and expenditures for equipment and repairs of the library building. Moreover, when there is mention of expenditure for books does it mean also, as it sometimes does, expenditure for periodicals? And does it mean, as it sometimes does, expenditure for binding? If one is not made uneasy by this lack of definition, one can find some pleasure, perhaps, in comparing the relation of library expenditures to enrolment of students in one institution with

that in another. Aware of the insecurity of the bases for comparison one is cautious.

Librarians know the difficulties. This book was apparently not written for librarians. Many college executives are aware of the situation. They will know how to evaluate the statements provided by the questionnaire. This book, however, seems to be directed to those college presidents who are not yet alive to the full importance of the library in the work of an institution of higher education. For them and for their colleagues of the Board of Trustees it is particularly important to provide clearly comparable data. In short we are still in need of a standard terminology in education if comparisons are to be helpful.

DAVID A. ROBERTSON

MEDICAL EDUCATION

Final Report of the Commission on Medical Education, Office of the Director of Study, 630 West 168th Street, New York City, 1932.

Medical Care for the American People, The Final Report of the Committee on the Cost of Medical Care. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1932.

Never before has a profession been given such comprehensive and authoritative consideration as that which is embodied in these two reports. Distinguished educators, administrators, and practicing physicians have directed the numerous, exhaustive studies made possible by generous financial support. Conclusions are carefully summarized and definite—if not unanimously supported—recommendations are reached. The final report of the Commission on Medical Education fills 400 pages of text and adds an appendix containing 160 tables of solid, statistical data. The Committee on the Cost of Medical Care has published no less than 28 separate studies, which have been produced during the past five years by competent, carefully directed investigators. The medical profession has been the first to formulate a thorough program of scientific research for the purpose of appraising needs to be met, of planning for the training and supervising of its personnel, and of devising forms of social organization which will enable physicians to discharge their services to society with economic adjustments equitable for members of the profession and adapted to the resources of the patients. Other professions may profit by a study of the general scope and methods of the investigations, may learn much from the efforts to apply newer principles of pedagogy to professional training, and may be inspired by this example of courageous formulation of plans which are obviously goals for future efforts rather than possible present achievements.

Evidently industrial and agricultural maladjustments are paralleled by those in this—and no doubt in other—professional fields. The examinations of school children, industrial workers, and drafted men show that there are enormous amounts of uncared for morbidity and preventable physical defects. Complete medical services are beyond the reach of the half of families in the United States who are in the groups with incomes less than \$2000, and are rarely obtained by those who have higher incomes. The services now sought require a supply of physicians with training and professional interests apportioned quite differently from what are found to be present tendencies. Thus patients making office visits to physicians seek most frequently various forms of minor surgery or assistance in overcoming infections of the upper respiratory tract, and about a third of the home services of doctors are for the latter forms of sickness. A large majority of these and other medical needs can be dealt with by physicians competently trained for general practice and supplied with necessary laboratory assistance and opportunities for occasional consultations with, or enlistment of services of, specialists. Yet at the present time over 40 per cent of the physicians who left the medical schools in 1915 limit their practice to specialties, and an equal proportion of those who graduated in 1920 give particular attention to specialties. Half of those who confine their activities to limited fields are without experience in general practice. The final report of the Committee on Cost of Medical Care summarizes faulty adjustments as follows:

"These facilities, however, are not distributed primarily according to needs, but rather according to real or supposed ability of patients to pay for services. As a result, many communities are undersupplied with practitioners, hospitals, and other facilities, while others have a surplus. For example, in 1929 there was one physician to every 1431 persons in South Carolina, as contrasted with one to every 571 in California and one to every 621 in New York State. In 1928, there were 19 dentists per 100,000 population in Mississippi, and 101 in Oregon. Of the 3072 counties in the United States, only 1765 in 1928 had hospitals for general community use. Wisconsin had one bed for community use to each 154 persons, while South Carolina had one to each 749 persons. Similar conclusions are reached from data on other states. There is also maldistribution by type. For example, approximately 45 per cent of the physicians of the country have completely or partially limited their practice to a specialty, although apparently the needs of the people could be met adequately if not more than 18 per cent of physicians were specialists." (Med. Care of the Am. Peop., pp. 4-5.)

Both reports show that preventive medical services and public health activities are largely neglected. Yet no country is so well supplied

with physicians as the United States; it is claimed that there are 25,000 more doctors than are required to give adequate medical services. It is estimated also that if the present rate of increase continues, this oversupply will be even greater in the future. (Med. Educ., p. 100.)

Stated briefly, the studies of needs for services support the conclusions that the medical course should prepare for general practice, that specialization should follow this more comprehensive course, that there should be a period of general practice before beginning the preparation for a specialty, and that care in the selection of personnel and strict regulation of admission to practice will not endanger the supply necessary to meet medical needs. Inasmuch as no training can give complete command of the vast accumulation of rapidly expanding medical knowledge, the course should endeavor to develop the initiative and resourcefulness of the students so that they may know how to focus available resources on the needs of each patient, and so grow in knowledge and skill by a process of continuous self-education. The report summarizes these new pedagogical policies as follows:

"The present tendency is to develop self-reliance and responsibility in the student for his own training and to individualize that training according to his ability, interests, and preparation. These aims can be realized only on the basis of learning by doing. They can not be accomplished by didactic exercises and demonstration alone. The change in attitude and methods is exemplified by the discontinuance of the rigid class system and uniform time and course schedules which require every student to complete exactly the same course in the same time, and the substitution of small sections; personal contacts between students and teachers in clinic, hospital, and laboratory; use of tutors, counsellors, and preceptors; reasonable freedom for reading, thinking, and elective work; emphasis upon achievement rather than attendance; reduction of lecturing to a minimum; encouragement of independent work; stimulation of scientific curiosity; use of comprehensive instead of departmental examinations; and postponement of specialized training until after completion of basic preparation. These endeavors are in response to the realization that there can be no single way to learn or to teach medicine, but that the methods to be employed should be adapted as far as possible to the preparation and ability of the individual student." (Med. Educ. 177; 392-395.)

In order that the medical course may be treated as a unit rather than as a series of isolated subjects, continuous efforts must be made to promote correlation between such closely related subjects as bacteriology and pathology; physiology, anatomy, and biochemistry; as well as between these medical sciences and the clinical instruction. This is accomplished by conferences between faculty members, by joint instruction and examinations, and by giving students free time for read-

ing, thus broadening the scope of their classroom and clinical activities. (Med. Educ. 189 ff.)

Experience in history writing and physical examinations under expert guidance should develop ability to recognize conditions which require expert treatment and special study. Students in some schools take turns in serving as living models in order that their classmates may become familiar with the structure and functioning of a normal, human body. The patient rather than his disease should be the focusing point of attention. Hence emotional states, habits of living, employment conditions, family, and social relations often require study in order to be successful in diagnosis and treatment. Out-patient services, as well as clinical practice and internship, can be utilized profitably in the preparation of the general practitioner. The voluminous reports issued by the Commission describe many variations in the content and methods of courses in both American and European medical schools. Critical appraisals of values, in relation to those of the pedagogically sound course recommended by the Commission, make possible the self-criticisms which must take place when medical faculties make use of the recommendations, and at the same time endeavor to maintain the flexibility which is recognized throughout the report as necessary when the process of developing competent general practitioners is adapted to personal and community variations in needs.

The Committee on the Cost of Medical Care estimated that adequate medical and dental services could be supplied in urban communities at a per capita cost of \$20 to \$40 per annum. This would be made possible by the economies of cooperative services given in carefully administered medical centers which would serve groups varying in size with the needs and available facilities of different communities. These centers would be organized about hospitals and would supply services of general practitioners and specialists as well as of dentists, nurses, pharmacists, laboratory technicians, and other personnel. They would have complete equipments for the application of all available scientific knowledge. Such an organization should be non-profit making, should maintain adequate preventive as well as corrective services, and should compensate members of its staff at rates suited to their education, responsibilities, and community status. About one-half of the families in the United States have incomes so low that it is improbable that they would subscribe to such services without legal compulsion, and assistance from public funds would be needed in many places where the population is too scanty and poor to maintain such centers. Thus the complete medical services of the planned social regime of the future will make necessary new—probably post-graduate—courses dealing with the special field of administration of medical centers.

Pedagogical principles applied in these elaborate efforts to devise a sound medical course which are equally important to other fields of professional education may be summarized as follows:

(1) The course must be planned with a full knowledge of the present scope and probable future demands for the services which members of the profession render.

(2) The student rather than the subject of instruction should be the center of attention. He must acquire flexibility in meeting the demands of a rapidly changing society, and must learn to organize and apply available scientific knowledge to given situations.

(3) Overcrowding of the course with informational matter or with elaborate, highly specialized laboratory exercises should be avoided.

(4) In proportion as students progress to the stage where they are capable of initiative and profitable self-direction, they should be given free time, with competent personal or tutorial supervision, for activities of their own choice.

(5) Correlation of subjects and continuous cooperation between faculty members are required in order that the course may be unified and focused effectively on the services which the profession is expected to render.

(6) Civilized societies are entering upon a new era of careful planning. Members of different professions must understand the political, economic, and social forces which determine conditions under which their services are rendered, because these wider contacts with society should be made by those whose training and experience qualify them for the formulation and application of policies adapted to the welfare of the profession, as well as of the social groups which it serves.

LUCILE EAVES

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, TARIFF DECISION

The University of Illinois imported scientific apparatus for use in one of its educational departments. Customs duties were exacted at the rates prescribed by the Tariff Act of 1922. The University paid under protest, insisting that as an instrumentality of the State of Illinois, and discharging a governmental function, it was entitled to import the articles duty free.

The fact that the State in the performance of state functions may use imported articles does not mean that the importation is a function of the state government independent of federal power. The control of importation does not rest with the State but with the Congress. In international relations and with respect to foreign intercourse and trade the people of the United States act through a single government with unified and adequate national power. There is thus no violation of the principle which petitioner invokes, for there is no encroachment on the power of the State as none exists with respect to the subject over which the Federal power has been exerted. To permit the States and their instrumentalities to import commodities for their own use, regardless of the requirements imposed by the Congress, would undermine, if not destroy, the single control which it was one of the dominant purposes of the Constitution to create. It is for the Congress to decide to what extent, if at all, the States and their instrumentalities shall be relieved of the payment of duties on imported articles.

Decision of the U. S. Supreme Court, March 20, 1933

TULANE UNIVERSITY, FACULTY GROUP INSURANCE

During the Spring of 1932, the Tulane Chapter of the Association appointed a Committee to consult with the President and the Board of Administrators of Tulane University for the purpose of ascertaining what might be done toward establishing a plan of Group Insurance for the Tulane faculty. The Committee was pleased to find that the Board of Administrators had already been considering a plan and the activities of the Committee were welcomed in that direction. Shortly thereafter the Board voted to inaugurate a plan of Group Insurance at once. The local Committee had learned that disability contracts would not be written by any companies after September 1, and the Chairman therefore urged the advisability, from both faculty and administrative standpoints, of rapid action so that this feature of the insurance plan might be made available. The whole plan was hurried to completion and presented to the various faculties of the University for endorsement

and individual commitment. Members of the Chapter Committee and representatives of the Insurance Company made themselves available to the faculties of the University to explain and clarify various provisions of the plan. The necessary number of signatures was received and the plan was inaugurated as a University matter and became effective as of October 1, 1932. A pamphlet published by the University describes in full detail the provisions of the plan. The Chapter takes some pride in assisting in the completion of a Group Insurance Plan at Tulane University which has proved to be an important matter for the whole faculty of the Institution.

RESOLUTIONS FROM CHAPTERS

Whereas the government of the *National-Socialisten*, under the Chancellorship of Adolf Hitler, has repeatedly violated, in word and deed, the principles of academic freedom under which German scholarship has in the past achieved such glorious distinction;

Whereas the dismissal of eminent professors from German universities, merely because they belong to racial or political minorities, regardless of whether they have ever been politically active, is a direct attack on the ideals of the international commonwealth of learning;

Whereas the public burning of masterpieces of "non-Aryan" literature, planned for May 10, is a reversal to the worst traditions of the Dark Ages;

Therefore be it resolved that the New York University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors expresses its condemnation of these wanton violations of the principles for which it has always stood; and further

Be it resolved that the national council of the Association be petitioned to adopt a similar resolution.

Resolved That we, members of the Smith College Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, tender our sympathy and esteem to our colleagues in Germany, of whatever race or creed, who have been arbitrarily deprived of their positions or have felt it incumbent upon them, for reasons of principle, to resign. Holding that no true patriotism is inconsistent with academic and intellectual liberty, we deplore the spirit which, in the name of nationalism, is depriving the German people and the international community of culture of the services of so many of our most distinguished brethren.

HEALTH AND HOSPITAL SERVICE

Chapter Letter 2, February 6, invited supplementary information about economic conditions in regard to health and hospital service for faculty members. From a reply on the latter question, the following extract is of interest:

Until this chapter took up the matter, faculty men were without even emergency service. Sometime in the fall, the chapter president wrote the head of the health service requesting a statement of the status of the faculty with respect to his service, a statement which he could publish to the members of the chapter. As a result of subsequent communication with the president and the trustees, emergency service is now provided at rates comparable to those charged by the hospitals nearby, the nearest of which is thirteen miles away. The executive committee of the chapter is at work on ways and means of putting in a word relative to the imminent salary cut. The student newspaper regularly details a reporter to cover chapter meetings. If chapters generally were to cultivate their college papers, their power on the campus would be substantially increased, and the chapter would be at the same time spurred on to discuss at its meetings topics of immediate concern, attracting members to meetings and increasing membership.

COMMUNICATIONS

A CASE OF TENURE

Thank you for your kind letter of counsel. I am glad to report that the instructor whose position was in jeopardy has been reinstated until the close of the academic year. If he is dismissed then, it will undoubtedly be in accordance with accepted university procedure.

The state situation is badly complicated at present, but the college faculties in the state institutions are hoping for the best.

While we did not use the name of the Association in our recent skirmish, members of it led the opposition, secured justice for a colleague, and were definitely encouraged to "carry on" because of our Association connection.

I think you may regard the outcome as a virtual triumph for the Association and its principles, albeit unaccompanied by sounding brass or tinkling cymbals.

APPRECIATION OF THE APPOINTMENT SERVICE

(from an appointing officer)

"Some two years ago I had occasion to secure a minor employee and requested the assistance not only of the Association's service but also of several universities and one or two of the better commercial agencies. While one of the universities succeeded in suggesting a candidate who seemed to be more pointedly fitted for the particular task, it was my feeling that the Association handled the nominations and suggestions much more effectively than did either of the other agencies with whom we communicated. In particular, the Association's service was so superior to that of the commercial agencies as to leave no ground for comparison."

(from a junior member)

"Though I am a novice in college teaching the Association has already served me far beyond any dues I may pay for some time to come, as certain of your files will attest. When I am again able to pay my share you may be sure I will do so gladly.

"To the Appointment Service, I owe the only news of vacancies which has come for months. Now that my University contacts are broken to a certain extent, it furnishes a ray of hope on a dark horizon."

MEMBERSHIP

ACTIVE MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of forty-five active and twenty-four junior members as follows:

University of Akron, Donald Hayworth, Edgar C. Roberts; University of Arkansas, Ida N. Chambers, Wilma Hill; Boston University, Charles T. Harrison; Brooklyn College, Lawrence S. Kennison, Frederik A. Olesen; Brothers College, Marshall C. Harrington; University of Buffalo, David E. Smith; University of California (Los Angeles), Donald C. Williams; University of Cincinnati, Ruth Streitz; Connecticut State College, Raymond H. Wallace; Colleges of the City of Detroit, Donald C. MacLachlan; Duke University, Harold L. Amoss, Lon L. Fuller; University of Florida, A. Moultrie Muckenfuss; Fordham University, Francis P. Donnelly; George Washington University, Franc Thénau; Goucher College, Marian M. Torrey; Hood College, Margaret C. Weeber; Howard University, Morris A. Raines; Kent State College, Edward H. Pake; University of Kentucky, Robert Haun; University of Michigan, Kimber C. Kuster; Mississippi Woman's College, William V. Parker, Dawson Phelps; University of Montana, Harry Turney High; Mount Holyoke College, Ruth E. Douglass, Ethel Eltinge; North Carolina State College, Erwin E. Goehring, Leon F. Williams; Princeton University, James M. Jarrett; Queen's University, O. L. Bockstahler; Rockford College, Elizabeth L. Mann; Rollins College, James M. Glass, James B. Thomas; Russell Sage College, Antonio P. Savides; Rutgers University, J. Moreno-Lacalle; University of South Carolina, McTyeire Daniel; University of Southern California, Sydney F. Duncan; Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, Charles B. Campbell; Tulane University, Florence Sytz, Marie J. Weiss; University of Utah, Vernon C. Fisk; University of Wisconsin, Delos S. Otis.

TRANSFERS FROM JUNIOR TO ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

University of Akron, Edgar P. Jones; University of Delaware, Harriet Bailly; Drexel Institute, M. Russell Wehr; Greensboro College, Elizabeth B. Young; Hunter College, Lily D. Mage; Lake Erie College, Edna S. Winters; Mount Holyoke College, D. Helen Wolcott; North Carolina College for Women, John A. Kelley; Ohio University, Thurman C. Scott; University of Oklahoma, Adriance S. Foster, Jennings J. Rhyne; University of Porto Rico, Ramon I. Gil; Smith College, F. W. Kaufmann; Stanford University, Kurt F. Reinhardt; Swarthmore College, Karl Reuning; North Texas State Teachers College, Lois A. Pearman; University of Washington, James E. Lynch; Wheaton College, Mildred W. Evans; Williams College, Paul Birdsall.

JUNIOR MEMBERS ELECTED

University of Akron, Dwight E. Gray; Brooklyn College, William L. Schaaf; Brown University, Howard L. Andrews; Dartmouth College, Richard K. Irons; Duke University, Clarence F. Korstian, J. Carlisle Mouzon; Harvard University, Murray E. Borish, Donald M. Dozer; University of Iowa, John A. Greenlee; Lafayette College, E. F. B. Fries; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Leland W. T. Cummings; University of Montana, A. J. Lewandowski, Hampton K. Snell; New York University, Cornelius G. Brennecke, P. Evans Coleman; Northwestern University, Norman Bennetton; Pennsylvania State College, William H. James; Rol-

lins College, Theodore Dreier, Alan Tory; University of South Carolina, Ewing T. Bonn; Vassar College, Fredericka Blankner; Yale University, Ruth Cameron; Not in University Connection, Frederick W. Meier (M. A., Tulane), New Orleans, La.; Reginald LeG. Swann (A.M., Harvard), Schenectady, N. Y.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following forty-nine nominations for active membership and five nominations for junior membership are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions¹ and will be considered by the Committee if received before June 25, 1933.

The Committee on Admissions consists of R. E. Dengler, Pennsylvania State, Chairman; A. L. Bouton, New York; H. L. Crosby, Pennsylvania; A. C. Lane, Tufts; A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins; W. T. Magruder, Ohio State; Julian Park, Buffalo.

Allen E. Andersen (Mathematics), Worcester Polytechnic
Verle L. Annis (Architecture), Southern California
Albert Bachem (Biophysics), Illinois
Laverne Bane (Speech), Utah
A. Stuart Campbell (Economics, Foreign Trade), Florida
David B. Cofer (English), Texas Agricultural and Mechanical
Anne Corbitt (Education), Shurtleff
Clyde Crobaugh (Economics), Boston
Ephraim Cross (Romance Languages), City College (New York)
Roy S. Dearstyne (Poultry Science), North Carolina State
Francis G. Dressel (Mathematics), Duke
Dewey C. Duncan (Mathematics), California (Berkeley)
Gertrude H. Dunham (German), Smith
Theodore E. FitzGerald (Accounting), Temple
Juan A. deGomar (Spanish), City of Detroit
Olive Goodrich (Home Economics), City of Detroit
Alta B. Hall (Speech), Southern California
Winfred A. Harbison (History), City of Detroit
Roscoe E. Harris (Physics), Lake Forest
Junius J. Hayes (Mathematics), Utah
Albert E. Hill (English), Nevada
Douglas G. Hill (Chemistry), Duke
Ferdinand F. Hintze (Geology), Utah
Edward C. Jandy (Sociology), City of Detroit
J. H. Jensen (Chemistry), South Dakota State Teachers (Northern)
Cornelia P. Kelley (English), Illinois
Laurence D. Lockie (Pharmacy), Buffalo
Amy W. McClelland (Fine Arts), Southern California
Georgiana P. McEntee (History), Hunter
James H. March (Business Administration), Western Reserve
Paul E. Martin (Physics), Muskingum
James E. Mills (Chemistry), South Carolina
Thomas W. Moore (Mathematics), Indiana
Esther Nelson (Library), Utah

¹ Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Washington Office, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Claude M. Newlin (English), Michigan State
Helaine Newstead (English), Hunter
Georgia E. Nobis (Education), Hunter
Ernest J. Reece (Library), Columbia
Veré L. Rubel (English), Hunter
Frances G. B. Sanderson (Home Economics), City of Detroit
George P. Schmidt (History), Rutgers
Stanley Seiple (Music), Thiel
Elizabeth-Vera L. Stern (Speech), Hunter
Donald L. Stone (Political Science), Dartmouth
A. J. Tieje (Geology), Southern California
Alva Turner (Physics), Hunter
Selman A. Waksman (Soil Microbiology), Rutgers
Claire V. Whiting (Modern Languages), Shurtleff
A. B. Wright (Art), Utah

NOMINATIONS FOR JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

Kenneth Clark (New Testament), Duke
Gladys Garland (Chemistry), Maine
Lawrence P. Gould (Chemistry), Cornell
Cecilia H. Hendricks (English), Indiana
John B. Lucke (Geology), Columbia

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF NOMINATIONS FOR ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

Troyer S. Anderson (History), Swarthmore
Maud M. Babcock (Speech), Utah
Brand Blanshard (Philosophy), Swarthmore
James Burnham (Philosophy), New York
Lillian Hatfield (Psychology), Maine
Walter Helfer (Music), Hunter
Emma Henkle (Education), Oregon Normal (Monmouth)
Ray Lepley (Philosophy), Bradley Polytechnic
R. H. Linker (French), North Carolina
Llewelyn R. McKay (Modern Languages), Utah
Arthur A. Metcalf (Education), Michigan State Normal (Ypsilanti)
Lennox A. Mills (Political Science), Minnesota
Mirah Mills (English), Morningside
Edna Mingus (English), Oregon Normal (Monmouth)
Edmund B. O'Leary (Economics, Business Organization), Dayton
Elmer Pendell (Sociology, Economics), Oregon Normal (Monmouth)
Lynn Perry (Civil Engineering), Lafayette
Phillip Rulon (Education), Harvard
Nathan W. Sanborn (Poultry), Florida
Joseph F. Santee (Education), Oregon Normal (Monmouth)
George Saslow (Biology), New York
Marie C. Swabey (Philosophy), New York
Rose H. Widtsoe (Home Economics), Utah
Otis B. Young (Physics), Illinois State Normal (Southern)

**SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF NOMINATIONS FOR
JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP**

John T. Baker (Philosophy), Columbia
Edward F. Barrows (Biology), Oregon Normal (Monmouth)
Charles Blumenfeld (Anatomy), Utah
Elizabeth Duffy (Psychology), New York
Ralph Ehle (German), Johns Hopkins
J. Paul Kemerer (Political Science, Physical Education), Pennsylvania State
Samuel M. Mayfield (Geology, Forestry), Chicago
William T. Miller (History), Ohio State
Gus B. Ulvin (Botany), Chicago
Howard K. Wallace (Biology), Florida

Appointment Service Announcements

The Appointment Service is open only to members but formal registration is necessary.

Those interested in keyed vacancies may have duplicates of their registration blanks transmitted to appointing officers on request.

Members registered with the Appointment Service may have brief announcements inserted in the Teachers Available section at a charge of \$1.00 per line for the first insertion and 50% of that amount for repetitions. Copy should reach the Washington Office not later than the end of the month preceding publication.

Administrative officers who are interested in announcements under Teachers Available may, upon inquiry, receive copies of registration papers of candidates. Appointing officers are invited to report vacancies at their institutions.

Vacancies Reported

Psychology: Professor and head of department, woman, southern woman's college. Outstanding woman of good personality. V 596

Secretarial Science: Instructor, man or woman, small eastern college. Courses (alternate years) in typing, accounting, teacher training, business organization, and marketing. Practical business experience advantages. Active Christian. Salary, about \$1800 first year. V 597

Library Service

Library Service: Woman, Ph.D. in classics, teaching experience, foreign study, offers her research service in literary or historical fields in institutions in New York City and vicinity; material examined, photostats secured. A 645

Teachers Available

Botany: Ph.D., experienced teacher with broad training. A 646

Botany, Biology, Genetics, Floriculture: Woman, Ph.D. Taught also physics, chemistry, physiology. Available fall or summer, 1933. A 647

Business (Executive Finance), Education, Sociology: Ph.D. N. Y. U., 1933. Six years' teaching and ten years' business. Publications. A 648

Chemical Engineering: Ph.D. 1932. Industrial experience. A 649

Chemistry: Ph.D. Analytical, physical, or inorganic. A 650

Chemistry: Ph.D. Nine years' successful experience in college and university teaching. Research. Publications. Available at once. A 651

Classics: Man, Ph.D. Harvard. Years of college experience. Wishes to teach classic languages and art. Available 1933. A 652

Classics: Young woman, Ph.D. Hopkins, seeks position giving college or university teaching experience. Available September. A 653

Classics and Classical Archaeology: Woman, Ph.D., experienced teacher, foreign study. A 654

Dean of Men: Ph.D. Columbia. Ten years' administration and teaching. Special work with freshmen. Best references. A 655

Deanship: Woman, single, Ph.D. in philosophy and education. Unusual background. Administrative experience in women's college and in co-educational institutions. Values opportunities for teaching, research, contacts with the public. Special interest in the education of prospective teachers. A 697

Economics, Business Administration: M.B.A. Four years' teaching experience. Available September, 1933. A 656

Economics, Business Administration: Married, M.C.S., N. Y. U.; course work and language for D.C.S. Three years' university teaching experience, seven years' banking experience. Trained in research. Special fields—banking, finance, and foreign trade. Available June. A 657

Economics, Business Administration: Ph.D., C.P.A. Publications. A 658

Education and Psychology: Man, 37, married, Ph.D. Columbia. Four years' secondary school and seven years' college teaching experience. Publications. Desires summer or permanent position in college personnel, educational psychology, or measurements. A 659

English: Man, 36, single, M.A. Oxford, Ph.D. Harvard. Several years' experience as college department head. Desires teaching position in a college or university. Available fall of 1933. A 660

English: Man, married, Ph.D. Yale. Six years' experience as college department head, four years' experience in college administration. Platform experience. Desires position in teaching or administration, or combination of the two. A 661

English: Married, Ph.D. Virginia, 1928. Publications and platform experience. The drama and novel. Available fall of 1933. A 662

English: Ph.D. Harvard, 1921. Ten years' experience directing graduate work. Foreign travel. Research. Publication. Comparative literature in Middle Ages. Professorial rank; opportunity for research desired. A 663

English, French (fluent): M.A. Experienced, progressive. A 698

French: Man, single, candidate M.A. summer, 1933. Eight years' college teaching experience. Available fall, 1933. A 664

French: Ph.D. Five years' experience in American universities; 15 years in European colleges. Also qualified to teach German, Latin, and European history. A 665

French, German: Man, Ph.D. (American and French). Long training, wide teaching experience. Department head. Research, publications. A 666

French, Spanish: Man under 35, married, Ph.D. Long experience with steady advancement. About equally interested and well prepared in both languages; fluent command. Literature, including both older and more recent periods; phonetics; philology; teaching methods. Publications. A 667

French, Voice: Man, native, single; candidate M.A. June, 1933. Six years' teaching experience. Available fall, 1933. A 668

Geology: Ph.D. 1925. Eight years' teaching. Research in paleontology and stratigraphy. Field work. Publications. Desires transfer, western institution preferred. Available July. A 669

German: Man, Ph.D. Fifteen years' experience in middle western and southern institutions; acting head of German department four years in eastern women's college. Travel in Germany. Author of textbook. A 670

German: Ph.D. Five years' experience in American universities; 15 years in European colleges. Also qualified to teach French, Latin, and European history. A 671

German, French, Spanish: Man, Ph.D. Wisconsin (German and French, majors; Spanish, minor). Three and one half years' foreign residence; 19 years' college experience. Available June or September. A 672

History: Man, 37, Ph.D. Chicago. Two years' experience teaching and as acting head of department. Available September, 1933. A 673

History or Art: Man, M.A. Yale, near Ph.D. Seventeen years' university teaching, five as head of department. A 674

History (some Economics): Man, 28, married, Ph.D. eastern university. Over three years of college and university teaching. Available June, 1933. A 675

History, Political Science: Man, 35, Ph.D. Wisconsin. Twelve years' teaching, four full-time university. Available July, 1933. A 676

Journalism: Man, 39, M.A. Graduate work history, psychology. Professor and department head, twelve years. Present, permanent appointment class "A" journalism school. Weekly, small city daily, metropolitan newspaper experience. Publications. Editorial, teaching, administrative record. A 677

Mathematics: Man, married, M.A. with additional work in education and personnel. Eight years' mathematics teaching in college. Experience in personnel and supervision. Desires position in mathematics. A 678

Mathematics: Man, 30, married, Ph.D. Seven years' university teaching. Now assistant professor in a southern university on permanent appointment, but desires transfer to liberal arts college or university in northeast. Especially successful in molding mathematics work to liberal arts point of view. A 679

Music: A.B. Superior training here and abroad. Nine years' college experience. Piano, also theoretical courses. A 680

Natural Science Education: Man, M.A., near Ph.D. Five years' university and seven years' high school. Methods of teaching science, orientation courses, geography, and chemistry. A 681

Philosophy: Ph.D. Twelve years' college and university experience; now associate professor in eastern college. Available September, 1933. A 682

Physics: Man (family and dependents), eleven years' experience university teaching; one year European travel. Now on leave studying, desires connection September, 1933. A 683

Physiology: Man, Ph.D. Chicago. Thirteen years' teaching experience. Interested in development of physiology as a science, and in research opportunity. A 684

Political Science, Economics: Ph.D. Four years' experience in professorial capacity, three fellowships. Public administration and public finance. Publications. Desires either teaching or research. Available fall or summer, 1933. A 685

Political Science, History: Ph.D., LL.B. Three years' teaching. A 686

Psychology: Man, 29, Ph.D. Desires summer work. A 687

Psychology (Educational and General): Man, 29, married (one child), Ph.D. Training and research in gestalt and bond. Teaching and research assistant two years. A 688

Public Speaking (Debate, Oratory): Man, 45, widowed. Twenty-two years' college teaching, professorial rank, head of department. Research. Foreign travel. Publications. Textbooks. Nationally known. A 689

Russian: Language and history. Five years' teaching experience. A 690

Sociology: Ph.D. Ten years' college teaching. Research in Orient and Hawaii. Publications. Interested in student counselling. A 691

Spanish, French, German: Woman, M.A. Chicago, credits toward Ph.D. Nine years' college teaching, ten years' foreign residence. Available summer or fall, 1933. A 692

Speech, Debate, Dramatics: Man, 29, married, M.A. Chicago. Teaching experience. A 693

Zoology, Biology: Man, M.S., Sc.D. Johns Hopkins, June. Specialty human parasitology, invertebrate zoology. Teaching experience. A 694

Zoology or Biology: Man, 39, with doctorate from Johns Hopkins. Fourteen years in university teaching. A 695

Zoology and Genetics: Man, Sc.D. Harvard. Two years' college teaching. Now National Research fellow. A 696

MacMahan Island

Maine

*An Ideal Place for
Study*

Rest

Recreation

A unique combination of pine woods and sea; land and water sports for the young folk; inexpensive cottages or The Lodge with good food; congenial associates.

Accessible by Train and Automobile.

In beautiful Sheepscot Bay near Bath and Boothbay Harbor.

Write for Information.



If this is your *Sabbatical Year*, or if you have the time available, we suggest you invest in the supreme adventure—an extensive cruise. Travel costs have never been so low, and it is often cheaper to travel than to stay at home.

Cruise *Around the World*, independently, economically. Your cruise lasts as long as you wish—splendid ships sail fortnightly

from most important ports on the globe. A 105 day cruise costs \$880, New York to New York.

Cruise to the golden lands of the *Mediterranean*. Excellent steamers sail fortnightly—many interesting ports of call—including visits in Egypt or Palestine. A first class, 42 day cruise costs \$595, New York to New York.

Send for Literature

AMERICAN EXPRESS
Travel Service

65 Broadway

New York

(When writing to advertisers, please mention the Bulletin)

VOLUME XIX
In Two Sections

MAY, 1933

NUMBER 5
Section Two

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TEACHING

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Publication Office: 20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

Editorial Office: 744 JACKSON PLACE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September.

Entered as Second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at
Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TEACHING

WILLIAM B. MUNRO (History and Government)
California Institute of Technology, *Chairman*

F. K. RICHTMYER (Physics)
Cornell University, *Vice-Chairman*

FERNANDUS PAYNE (Zoology)
Indiana University, *Secretary*

GEORGE BOAS (Philosophy)
Johns Hopkins University

A. L. BONDURANT (Classics)
University of Mississippi

ALZADA COMSTOCK (Economics)
Mount Holyoke College

HARDIN CRAIG (English)
Stanford University

CHARLES H. JUDD (Education)
University of Chicago

HOMER L. DODGE (Physics)
University of Oklahoma, *Field Director*

Advisory Members

JAMES R. ANGELL, Yale University

S. P. CAPEN, University of Buffalo

L. D. COFFMAN, University of Minnesota

KATHRYN McHALE, Association of University Women

H. W. TYLER, General Secretary, A. A. U. P.

W. E. WICKENDEN, Case School of Applied Science

ERNEST H. WILKINS, Oberlin College

PREFATORY NOTE

This Report is divided into four parts:

PART I (*Introduction*) explains the scope of the inquiry and the procedure followed by the Committee in its work.

PART II (*The Committee's Findings*) contains a statement of conclusions and recommendations.

PART III (*General Discussion of the Committee's Findings*) is devoted to a review and explanation of the findings, prepared by the Chairman of the Committee with the assistance of the Field Director and the Secretary. For what is contained in this general discussion the other members of the Committee, including the advisory members, have not been asked to assume responsibility and hence are not to be regarded as necessarily concurring in all the views which are there set forth.

PART IV (*Appendix*) includes some supplementary and illustrative material.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

INTRODUCTION

	Page
1. Origin of the Inquiry.....	7
2. Its General Purpose.....	8
3. Organization of the Work.....	8
4. Its Limited Scope.....	9
5. The Specific Problems Studied.....	10
6. The Committee's Procedure.....	11
7. Data and Discussions.....	13
8. The Survey of Printed Materials.....	14
9. Meetings of the Committee.....	15

PART II

THE COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS

1. The Purpose of Teaching.....	17
2. The Quality of College Teaching Today.....	17
3. The Attraction of Superior Personnel to the Profession.....	18
4. Present Facilities for the Selection of College Teachers.....	19
5. The Relation of Teaching to Research.....	21
6. Are Criteria of Good Teaching Practicable?.....	22
7. The Rating of Teachers by Students and Alumni.....	23
8. Teacher Training for College Teachers.....	23
9. The Teacher's Responsibility for Educational Policy.....	25
10. Assisting the Teacher in Service.....	26
11. Special Recognition of Good Teaching.....	27
12. The Teacher's Security of Tenure.....	28
13. Non-Teaching Activities in Their Effect upon Teaching.....	29
14. The Proper Determination of the Teaching-Load.....	29
15. Dividing Large Classes into Small Sections.....	30
16. Sectioning on the Basis of Ability or Achievement.....	31
17. Comprehensive Examinations and External Examiners as Aids to Good Teaching.....	32
18. New Type Tests as a Means of Improving College Teaching.....	32
19. Administrative Machinery for the Improvement of Teaching.....	33
20. Experiments with New Methods of Instruction.....	33

PART III

GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS

1. The Purpose of Teaching.....	36
2. The Quality of College Teaching Today.....	38
3. The Attraction of Superior Personnel to the Profession.....	42
4. Present Facilities for the Selection of College Teachers.....	46
5. The Relation of Teaching to Research.....	53
6. Are Criteria of Good Teaching Practicable?.....	56
7. The Rating of Teachers by Students and Alumni.....	58
8. Teacher Training for College Teachers.....	61
9. The Teacher's Responsibility for Educational Policy.....	70
10. Assisting the Teacher in Service.....	74
11. Special Recognition of Good Teaching.....	79
12. The Teacher's Security of Tenure.....	82
13. Non-Teaching Activities in Their Effect upon Teaching.....	83
14. The Proper Determination of the Teaching-Load.....	86
15. Dividing Large Classes into Small Sections.....	87
16. Sectioning on the Basis of Ability or Achievement.....	91
17. Comprehensive Examinations and External Examiners as Aids to Good Teaching.....	91
18. New Type Tests as a Means of Improving College Teaching.	94
19. Administrative Machinery for the Improvement of Teaching.	96
20. Experiments with New Methods of Instruction	
(a) Honors Courses.....	98
(b) Independent Study Courses.....	99
(c) Group Majors.....	100
(d) Teaching by Tutors or Preceptors.....	100
(e) Discussion Conferences.....	101
(f) Free Periods for Reading.....	102
21. A Word in Conclusion.....	103

PART IV

APPENDIX

I. Preliminary List of Questions Prepared by the Committee and Submitted for Discussion to the Chapters of the Asso- ciation.....	104
II. Reply of the Williams College Chapter to the Preliminary List of Questions.....	106

III. Reply of the University of Kansas Chapter to the Preliminary List of Questions.....	109
IV. University of Washington, Questionnaire Used in the Evaluation of Courses and Instructors by Students....	111
V. University of Kentucky, A Self-Rating Scale for College Teachers.....	117
VI. Brief List of Books on Problems of Higher Education.....	120

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TEACHING

PART I INTRODUCTION

1. ORIGIN OF THE INQUIRY

At the annual meeting of 1930, President E. H. Wilkins, of Oberlin College, an Honorary Member of the Association, gave an address on "Recent Trends in Higher Education," in which he stressed the importance of a careful study of the improvement of college teaching by the Association. In the autumn of the same year, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, at the request of the Council of the Association, provided a grant of funds to be used in making a study of the means whereby college and university instruction might be improved. In requesting this grant of funds, the Association pointed out that criticism of college teaching was being voiced from various quarters and that it seemed desirable to have a self-study of the situation made by the teachers themselves.

It is true, of course, that the problem of securing an improvement in the quality of university teaching has been studied a considerable number of times, but these studies have either been confined to a single institution or, when conducted on a broader scale, the investigators have almost invariably been administrative officials, educational researchers, or other persons connected with schools and departments of education. Extensive studies of teaching methods in individual subjects, moreover, have sometimes been made by college teachers, but no canvass of the problem in its broader implications is known to have been made by them or under their auspices.

Yet it ought to be self-evident that suggestions for the improvement of standards in any profession, if they are to be hospitably received, must come from within. In this case they must come from the teachers themselves. As respects their attitude on this matter, college professors do not differ from men in any other profession. Lawyers do not care to have laymen tell them how to do their work, nor do physicians, clergymen, nor engineers. The college classroom is the professor's castle. He does not object to the invasion of it by his own colleagues who understand his problems and difficulties, but he reacts against the intrusion of any one outside that circle who undertakes to scrutinize and appraise his work.

2. ITS GENERAL PURPOSE

What the Association proposed, therefore, was not an enterprise of educational research, carried through in accordance with the technique customarily used in such undertakings. With no intent to disparage research studies of the educationist type it was felt that something might be gained by proceeding in a different way. Accordingly the proposal was that the Association endeavor to ascertain, in a general way, the attitude of its twelve thousand members with respect to three broad questions, namely:

1. What, in the judgment of college teachers, are the chief problems connected with the improvement of college teaching?
2. Is there any consensus of opinion among college professors, or any approach to a consensus, with respect to the ways in which these problems can be solved?
3. What experiments in the way of improving the effectiveness of college teaching are now being carried on, and what is the judgment of college professors as to the probable success of these experiments?

It will be noted that the scope of such an inquiry embraces more than mere fact finding. And properly so, for fact finding is not an end in itself. The opinions of a large number of men in any profession, on matters directly related to their own daily work, ought to be worth having, especially if such opinions are in fairly general agreement. Surely if it is desired to have college professors think about their work in new ways it is an essential first step to find out what they are now thinking.

It is true, of course, that even unanimity of opinion among men who are best in a position to observe the facts, and to have judgments upon them, does not of itself guarantee correctness; on the other hand it does suggest that the burden of proof be placed upon those who think differently. One may be fairly certain, at any rate, that no real or enduring improvement in the quality of college teaching can be achieved by any movement which treats the views of the professoriate as negligible. College professors will neither accept nor be guided by recommendations which they have had no part in framing. This is the justification of a self-study.

3. ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK

To carry on this inquiry the President of the American Association of University Professors appointed a committee of eight members, each

of whom represents an important field of the curriculum. To this committee seven advisory members were appointed in order that counsel and assistance might be had from representative college and university administrators and from others who were known to possess a broad acquaintance with the problems of higher education. Arrangements were also made whereby the committee would be provided with a field director to supervise the gathering of data and a secretary to assist it in surveying the large number of reports, books, articles, and other literature which has been published with reference to college teaching during recent years.

4. ITS LIMITED SCOPE

At the very outset of its deliberations the committee faced a difficult problem with respect to the scope and limitations of its work. For it promptly found that the problem of securing an improvement in the quality of college teaching links itself up with many related questions of collegiate purpose and organization. To what end does the college exist? What is its proper place in the whole scheme of American education? Should not these questions be answered before entering upon a discussion of less fundamental problems? Can anything be accomplished in the way of improving the quality of college and university teaching unless it is preceded by an agreement concerning the purpose for which the teaching is done?

So with some other questions of far-reaching implication. Good teaching must have some relation to the quality of the students who are being taught. How, then, can teaching be greatly improved unless the college is properly articulated to the schools which furnish the incoming freshmen? Or how can teaching be made effective if campus activities are given free rein to compete with the classroom for undergraduate energy and interest? What, moreover, is the relation between improved teaching and the remuneration of college teachers? Such questions are by no means irrelevant to the main issue, but the committee decided that it had neither the time nor the money to explore all of them. Its only practicable alternative, therefore, has been to concentrate attention upon certain immediate and practical problems connected with the improvement of teaching, making no attempt to follow the subject through all its ramifications.

Especially the committee has felt that it could not go afield into such highly controversial questions as the underlying purpose of undergraduate education, or the means of inducing secondary schools to send better prepared students to the colleges, or the proper standards for admission, or the organization of college curricula, or the general relations between college faculties and governing boards. While realizing

that these and many other matters have a demonstrable relation to the problem of improved teaching, it was felt essential to confine the study to questions which seem to be more directly linked with the process of instruction.

5. THE SPECIFIC PROBLEMS STUDIED

Accordingly the committee drew up and submitted to the entire membership of the American Association of University Professors a list of questions which seemed to be worthy of serious discussion by college teachers.¹ In the main, these questions relate to problems of undergraduate instruction. The teaching of graduate students is not believed to be a matter calling for special attention save in so far as such students are being trained to become college teachers. The committee's purpose in framing this list of questions was to focus discussion upon the things which seemed best fitted for the interplay of professorial opinion and the ones on which something approaching a consensus among college professors might be possible. Hence the questions did not deal for the most part with matters of educational purposes or ideals but with practical problems of teaching on which the testimony of in-service teachers would presumably be of value.

More specifically it seemed desirable to gather data and opinions on such problems as the recruiting of capable young men and women for the profession of college teaching, the facilities for discovering and rewarding good teachers, the procedures whereby poor teachers might be helped to become better ones, the possibility of working out usable criteria of good teaching, the relation of examinations to effective classroom instruction, the influence of research and of other non-teaching activities upon the college teacher's work, and the value of the various experiments with new teaching methods which are now being carried on at many institutions of higher education.

In framing this list of topics the committee appreciated the fact that there are other questions of equal importance and urgency in relation to the question immediately in hand. But the first obligation of an educational inquiry is to establish its own boundaries lest it be drawn off the main highway and induced to scatter its energies in too many directions. A field of this kind is like a medieval city in that there are almost innumerable side streets and byways which one can explore with interest and profit if there is time enough to spare and money enough to spend. The possible means of bettering the quality of collegiate instruction are so numerous, and so varied in character, that no single survey could hope to cover them all.

¹ See Appendix, pp. 104-105.

Hence the present committee hopes that its mission will not be misunderstood. Its self-study was not projected as an elaborate and costly enterprise in educational research. Rather it was designed to be, and has been, an attempt to find what college teachers believe to be the chief hindrances to better teaching and what they regard as the most practicable means of removing these obstacles. For that reason the committee has not attempted to solve problems but has devoted itself to finding out what the problems are, what attempts are being made to deal with them, and what values are attached to these endeavors. The surmounting of the various obstacles which now stand in the way of greater teaching effectiveness must be the task of the whole body of college teachers and can not be achieved through the suggestions of any single committee or research agency. The first step toward the solution of a problem in any field is to find out what kind of problem it is and whether it is a problem at all. And the ones best qualified to determine that question, so far as college teaching is concerned, are those who come into daily contact with it.

6. THE COMMITTEE'S PROCEDURE

The procedure followed in the inquiry was adapted to this end. At the outset the committee decided that the methods commonly used in educational researches ought not to be followed in the present study. This usual plan is to employ one or more experts in the technique of educationist research to gather material, put it together, interpret it, and sometimes to prepare a report in provisional form for review by those in charge. Such material, in most instances, is gathered by sending out questionnaires, sometimes very elaborate ones, in large numbers. These questionnaires are usually addressed to college and university presidents, deans, and other administrative officers who are assumed to be familiar with the educational problems and processes of their respective institutions. Or, if they are not, it is taken for granted that they will refer the inquiry to some one who does possess this knowledge. The literature relating to problems of higher education in America is filled with conclusions and recommendations based upon data accumulated in this way.

In fact this questionnaire bombardment has developed into such a barrage that college officials have run to cover. These printed or mimeographed sheets, with their long array of queries, come in rapid succession from all quarters. Often they ask for statistics which would take whole days to compile. They request not only facts and figures but opinions and personal impressions. Occasionally some of the questions are models of naïve futility. At any rate most of those to whom these questionnaires are addressed have come to look upon them as a

major affliction. Answering them is almost everywhere regarded as an irksome chore, to be evaded by passing it along to somebody else who may or may not be qualified to provide what is asked for.

Those recipients who are definitely interested in the subject matter of a questionnaire, or who have strong personal views with respect to the issues, are the ones most likely to send their replies. On the other hand those who have no personal interest or fixed opinions can all too often be counted upon to put the questionnaire in the waste-basket, or to answer it in an altogether perfunctory way. The result is that data and opinions gathered in this way do not always represent a fair cross-section of the facts or of carefully formed judgment. Rough guesses and momentary reactions often masquerade in the guise of data and opinion. Those who stand ready to pronounce their categorical *Yes* or *No* on questions of educational policy or methods are usually the ones who have bestowed the least thought upon such questions. Educators who have thought questions through are usually qualified in their conclusions. Such reservations are not always easy to embody in the answers to a questionnaire and they are even more difficult to tabulate when the replies have all come in.

Expressions of opinion obtained by using the questionnaire method, moreover, are *ex parte* in their nature. They are given without hearing the pros and cons discussed. It is not improbable that the answers in many instances would be different if those framing their replies were afforded the opportunity of listening to a full discussion of the issues. Notwithstanding these obvious shortcomings, however, great masses of data and opinion have been gathered by the questionnaire method, and generalizations drawn from them have been paraded before college teachers as unassailable.

These considerations led the committee to decide that most of the data gathered for its use, whether in the form of information or opinion, should be secured by personal visitation rather than by thrusting bundles of form letters and question sheets into the mails. It was led to this decision by the further fact that in many institutions throughout the country careful studies of various problems connected with the improvement of teaching were known to have been made by faculty committees. The results of such studies rarely appear in published form. The usual practice is to have them typewritten or mimeographed for use by the faculty concerned. Then, when the discussion has been finished, they go into the secretary's files and are usually forgotten except by those who have had a hand in making them. There are few questions affecting the interests of higher education which have not been surveyed in this way, and sometimes with great care, by competent committees in individual institutions. Such reports form a large and valuable body of unpub-

lished material, and the only way to get hold of them is by personal visitation.

In the study of educational questions, moreover, it is not enough to gather the facts. It is not enough to know that certain experiments are being carried on and that they are proving successful from the standpoint of those responsible for them. Almost every educational experiment is a huge success in the minds of those who father it. But it may not be so regarded by others, in the same institution, who have an equal or even better right to pass judgment upon it. The facts may not be in dispute but they are frequently susceptible to great differences of interpretation. Hence the desirability of having the material drawn from the experience of each institution made the basis of some discussion at the hands of those who are most familiar with it.

A final consideration which influenced the committee to utilize the method of personal visitation was the desirability of stimulating large groups of college professors, by personal contact, to think and talk about their own teaching problems. Many there are of this profession who will come together and discuss common problems with their own colleagues but who will not read books or reports dealing with such matters. If this coming together for an exchange of ideas could be promoted on a sufficiently large scale it seemed that the present study would be worth while, quite apart from any conclusions reached or recommendations made. The plan of visitation would at least give many local chapters of the Association an incentive to hold special meetings devoted to discussions of the committee's work.

7. DATA AND DISCUSSIONS

Accordingly an arrangement was made whereby Professor Homer L. Dodge of the University of Oklahoma was enabled to visit a large number of institutions as Field Director for the committee. Obtaining leave of absence from his regular academic duties, Professor Dodge followed an itinerary which took him into all sections of the country. First and last he spent some time at more than seventy colleges and universities. These included institutions of every type, large and small, public and endowed, sectarian and non-sectarian. Arrangements for these visits were made in advance with officers of the local chapters so that immediately on his arrival the Field Director was placed in contact with appropriate members of the administrative staff, or with members of the institution's committee on instruction, or with such individuals as seemed to be especially qualified to furnish the information and data desired by the committee in its work. In many instances the officers of local chapters went to much trouble in arranging interviews and otherwise facilitating the collection of material without loss of time. Repeatedly it was found

that various questions relating to the improvement of instruction had been studied by local committees within recent years and that the results of these studies could be had in summary form.

In almost all cases the arrangements provided for a special meeting of the local chapter to permit the presentation of questions by the Field Director, for a full discussion by the members, and incidentally to secure an evaluation of the data which had been gathered locally. At these chapter meetings such experiments with new methods of instruction as were being carried on at the institution were explained to the Field Director and any local conflicts of opinion as to their success could be brought out. Points of view which could never have been elicited by the use of a questionnaire were set forth. These chapter discussions proved interesting, informative, and at times spirited. More than two thousand members of the Association were present at the various meetings, an average of about thirty at each.

In addition a number of institutions were visited by individual members of the committee, including some of the advisory members, and in a few cases the teachers belonging to local chapters at a number of neighboring institutions were brought together for a general meeting. Such meetings, for example, were held by the northern California chapters at San Francisco, by the New York City chapters at Columbia University, by four Pennsylvania chapters at Philadelphia, and by the southern California chapters, seven of them, at Pasadena. Finally, a good deal of supplementary material was obtained from formal reports transmitted by chapters of the Association as well as by correspondence between the Field Director and the chapter officers of those colleges and universities which he was not able to visit.

8. THE SURVEY OF PRINTED MATERIALS

Meanwhile it seemed desirable not only to gather facts and opinions in this way but to make a survey of the large mass of books, reports, articles, and other literature relating to college and university teaching which have been published during recent years. The amount of this material is very large and no committee could expect to become familiar with even the more significant portions of it in a limited time. It has been estimated that more than a thousand books, reports, and articles relating directly or indirectly to problems of teaching at the college level have appeared during the past five years. Arrangements were therefore made with Professor Fernandus Payne of Indiana University, secretary of the committee, to take in hand the task of going through this great mass of literature, selecting from it the portions which seemed to bear upon the work of the committee, and presenting the more significant of these in summarized form. The digest which was prepared in this

way, under Professor Payne's direction, made a typewritten document of over two hundred pages.

A copy of this summary was provided for each member of the committee, including the advisory members. While the mass of literature thus examined was found to contain a considerable amount of relevant and useful material, the compilers discovered a surprisingly small number of books, reports, or articles dealing with such specific problems as the preparation of college teachers, the establishment of criteria for good teaching, the means of assisting the teacher in service, and the various hindrances to effective instruction. An even smaller amount of the printed material was found to be of the sort that conduced much to the solution of these problems.

9. MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

The committee has held four meetings, one in Washington, one in New Orleans (an informal meeting), and two in Chicago. At each of the two Chicago meetings the discussions continued over two entire days. The advisory members were invited to these meetings and most of them participated. At the first Chicago meeting (October, 1932) the draft of a "progress report" was agreed upon, and this preliminary report was communicated to all the chapters of the Association with a request for their comments. Many of them responded in an illuminating way. Meanwhile a series of articles by members of the committee and others dealing with various phases of the general problem, was published by the *Journal of Higher Education* as a means of stimulating interest in the subject.¹ The progress report was further discussed during an entire afternoon session at the annual meeting of the Association at New Haven in December, 1932. Following this discussion a preliminary draft of a final report was prepared and submitted in March, 1933, to the members of the committee, including the advisory members, for their individual comments, criticisms, and suggestions. When these had been received the preliminary draft was revised and submitted for adoption at the committee's second Chicago meeting (April 15-17, 1933). On this occasion the statement of findings, included in Part II of the present report, was further revised and finally adopted.

The procedure described in the foregoing pages has proved well adapted to the ends desired. It has enabled members of the committee to become acquainted with the results of past investigations, with the general literature of the subject, with the more significant experiments which are now being carried on for the improvement of college teaching,

¹ *Journal of Higher Education*, December, 1932. Most of these were subsequently reprinted in whole or in part in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors for December, 1932, and January, 1933.

and with the opinions of their colleagues in a large number of institutions. Best of all, it has given a large body of college teachers, representing different fields of instruction, the incentive to hold a series of meetings at which there has been a frank discussion of the various questions submitted to them by the committee. This discussion, in turn, has reflected itself in the committee's findings and recommendations.

Hence the present report is not^{ly} the work of a small body of men; it represents the outcome of an enterprise in which many have had a hand.

PART II

THE COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS

1. THE PURPOSE OF TEACHING

The purpose of college teaching is to induce self-propelled intellectual activity on the part of the student. Accordingly a frank recognition of this principle of self-education under guidance will suggest a sufficient definition of good teaching. To teach effectively is to lead, to inspire, and to guide the learner. Any technique or device that serves these ends is a good device.

Hence the most important question to ask about a teacher is: Does he interest and inspire his students to the extent of getting them to work hard for themselves? In order to attain this end a great variety of techniques are equally available from which a teacher may choose. In any discussion of the methods whereby college teaching can be improved it is imperative that the end, as well as the means, be kept to the forefront. No educational method or device can be of real service to the teacher unless its use induces the student to do better work on his own account. This ought to be axiomatic but in educational discussions it is sometimes overlooked. The end is lost to view in controversies over technique and methods. In achieving this end, moreover, the general spirit and temper of an educational institution is of the highest importance as a means of reinforcing the instruction.

2. THE QUALITY OF COLLEGE TEACHING TODAY

From this point of view what is the present situation as respects the quality of college instruction? Is it gaining the end? Is it inducing the great body of college students to educate themselves and to do it with enthusiasm, or is it merely plying them with information which they assimilate with varying degrees of reluctance? While the committee realizes the force of the criticisms that are being directed against the general standards of college instruction it does not believe, as the result of its survey, that most of these aspersions are warranted. On the other hand the quality of the instruction given in American colleges and universities will be better in proportion to the removal of the handicaps which are now imposed upon them by the whole system of American education. One of these is the virtual necessity of admitting many students who have not been trained in sound habits of study and whose widely varied interests do not comport with the curricula of the colleges which they enter. This deficiency in intellectual maturity and interest on the part of many undergraduates is the outcome of an urgent demand, on the part of great numbers of people, to be given a share in the

social and other opportunities which institutions of higher education afford.

Other difficulties which stand in the way of more effective collegiate instruction are the absence of any recognized criteria whereby good teaching can be clearly differentiated from poor teaching and rewarded accordingly; the tendency to over-encourage and over-value research even when it is not of high quality; the failure of the teaching profession to draw into it a sufficient number of broadly cultured young men and women who combine exceptional scholastic qualifications with personal qualifications of a high order; the frequent intrusion of outside activities upon the college teacher's time, and the relatively low scale of salaries paid to members of college faculties.

The committee is convinced that in spite of these obstacles the standards of college teaching have been steadily rising in the United States. On the other hand, a good deal of poor teaching is still being done. College instructors realize this fact quite as clearly as do administrators or students. Every effort should be made to improve the situation, and the initiative in this matter should come from the teachers themselves. Some of the existing hindrances to good teaching can be removed by their action. Some of the most-needed incentives to good teaching can be supplied in the same way.

3. THE ATTRACTION OF SUPERIOR PERSONNEL TO THE PROFESSION

There is a widespread conviction among college teachers that their profession has not made a sufficiently strong appeal to young college graduates who possess a combination of the highest intellectual and personal qualities. Only in part, moreover, does this lack of a strong appeal seem to result from the relatively modest scale of academic salaries. To an even larger extent it is probably due to the somewhat inflexible requirements that are imposed upon their students by the graduate schools. There is ground for the belief that if the graduate schools would offer young scholars of exceptional ability greater freedom from routine requirements in their programs of study the appeal of the college teaching profession to the exceptionally able might be strengthened.

Moreover, the durable satisfactions of the teaching profession in its higher ranks ought to be more clearly presented to those college graduates whose qualifications for entering it are apparent. Too little is now being done in the way of pointing out to undergraduate students of unusual promise the distinctive advantages of the profession. These attractions of the academic life, including the opportunity to explore new domains of knowledge, the daily contact with scholarly associates, and the helpful contact with the youth of the next generation during formative years—these should be impressed upon the attention of promising

young men and women as offsetting the relatively low rate of professorial remuneration. On the other hand, an equally vigorous and sustained effort should be made to discourage those whose promise of success in the profession seems at all doubtful.

No one should be advised to enter the profession of college teaching unless he has a real love for the scholar's life. No one should be encouraged to enter it unless he has a genuine liking for youth and for daily contact with youth. No one should be counselled to enter it, no matter how keen his intellect, unless he also possesses character and ideals, a zest for the pursuit of truth, and such personal qualities as will at least not militate against his chances of success. All this is especially to be desired during the next few years when the number of applicants for teaching positions in American universities and colleges is likely to be far in excess of the number of vacancies. There will be places for the best only, and perhaps not for all of these.

4. PRESENT FACILITIES FOR THE SELECTION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

Many institutions, especially among the smaller colleges, feel that the existing facilities for the selection of college teachers are inadequate. Administrative officers in these smaller institutions believe themselves to be seriously handicapped in their quest for good teachers by the fact that, prior at any rate to the establishment of the Appointment Service by this Association, there has been no practicable way of finding out where such men are or who among them would be available for appointment. Apart from resort to the commercial teachers' agencies there is little alternative but to make application to the graduate schools. These schools usually recommend men who have just completed their work for the doctor's degree and have shown promise in research. Rarely do they recommend any one who has been out teaching for some years and has demonstrated conspicuous effectiveness in the classroom. Unless such men have made a reputation as research workers they are likely to be overlooked.

The committee calls attention to a study made some years ago under the auspices of the American Association of University Professors in which the existing facilities for the selection of teachers were declared to be "haphazard and uneconomical."¹ The situation has not been appreciably bettered since that time except in so far as the Association's Appointment Service, now in its fifth year of operation, has been able in a measure to meet the need. The committee believes that this Appointment Service should be developed to a point where it would become of greater importance among the Association's activities. It should be

¹ Reports of the Committee on Methods of Appointment and Promotion. *Bulletin of the Association*, vol. xiv, pp. 95-102 (February, 1928) and vol. xv, pp. 175-217 (March, 1929).

developed into something more than a registration bureau. Recommendation is made that the Council of the Association consider the feasibility of maintaining, in connection with this Appointment Service, a system of visitation which should aim to obtain information about prospective vacancies and about teachers of unusual competence.

The committee also feels that advantage might be gained by encouraging colleges to publish announcements of vacancies in the professional journals. Such is the common practice at British universities and it is believed to be advantageous although it sometimes inspires what has been called a mad scramble for letters of recommendation on the part of candidates. If the plan is ever adopted in America, it would be wise to provide that applicants shall give references only and that no testimonials shall be forwarded unless or until they are asked for. Inquiry at a considerable number of colleges, during the course of the present survey, revealed the fact that a large majority of the professors whose opinions were sought are in favor of having vacancies announced in this way.¹

Meanwhile the committee concurs in the recommendation of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, appointed by the Association of American Colleges, to the effect that professors in the graduate schools should regard it as part of their duty to acquaint themselves with all readily ascertainable evidence as to the teaching ability of their graduate students, and that college administrative officers who are seeking new instructors should make insistent inquiry from the graduate schools as to the training and experience of all candidates recommended to them.

Various investigations have shown that most of those who receive the Ph.D. degree have already had experience in high school or college teaching, but there appears to be little or no checking up of their teaching records by those who give the recommendations or by those who make the appointments. Records covering teaching experience as well as academic credits should be provided in graduate schools. Care in recommending to small colleges only those who give promise of becoming successful teachers is an obligation which the graduate schools ought to take seriously.

On the other hand the committee ventures to point out that some of the blame for placing poor teachers in colleges should be laid at the doors of the latter institutions themselves. The appointing authorities in the colleges regularly insist that they want men with Ph.D. degrees who can not only teach but do research work. Moreover, they sometimes place undue stress upon special training and make their specifica-

¹ Votes taken by the Field Director at meetings of twenty-eight chapters showed a decisive majority in favor of the plan at all but two of them.

tions so strict that most of the best candidates are passed over in favor of some one whose training happens to fit the special requirements indicated. If colleges would ask the graduate schools to recommend to them the most promising teachers in designated subjects, irrespective of their degrees, research abilities, or fields of special interest, they would get men who have a very high probability of becoming good teachers.

Likewise the colleges have an obligation with respect to the placing of adequate emphasis upon scholarly background, versatility of intellectual interest, and general culture when they make appointments to their faculties. Such qualities are not only of prime importance in the classrooms and laboratories but they conduce to the strengthening of the whole faculty circle. It is from the college, during their undergraduate careers, that young men and women must get an inspiration to breadth of intellectual interest. If they do not get it there the graduate schools can hardly make good the deficiency. Hence arises the urgent desirability of placing strong emphasis, in the selection of college instructors, upon men and women who will bring to their work a broad outlook on life and a keen interest in the major activities of mankind.

5. THE RELATION OF TEACHING TO RESEARCH

One of the reasons commonly assigned for poor or indifferent teaching in the colleges is the absorption of the teacher's interest in his own research work. Too many college instructors, it is said, have been trained in graduate schools as though they were going to be research workers, and when they become members of college faculties they look upon their teaching as of secondary importance.

The committee believes that if there is any basis for this complaint the remedy lies with college administrators as well as with the graduate schools. For although most colleges assert themselves ready to recognize and reward good teaching on the same basis as successful research, the graduate schools have learned that they do not always carry this profession into practice. The good teacher, even though he be conspicuously good, often has to wait his turn in order of seniority, because there is no systematic way of singling him out and recognizing him by an early advancement.

Success in research, on the other hand, is bound to be observed and rewarded. It gets itself recognized by the publication of books, or of articles in scientific periodicals, as well as by the election of research scholars to academies or to offices in other learned societies. Men who secure such recognition are in line for calls to larger institutions, and the instructors whom a college advances most rapidly are the ones whom it is forced to promote in order to keep.

All this must not be construed as implying that research and teaching

are distinct activities, or that a very considerable concentration of energy upon research is an obstacle to good teaching. On the contrary, a vigorous interest in research or in some other form of creative and scholarly pursuit on the teacher's part contributes to the virility of his teaching. In his more advanced courses, at any rate, the good teacher is not merely the conductor of a sight-seeing tour through some field of knowledge. He is the leader of an exploring party. Hence it is difficult to see how any one can ever be an inspiring teacher unless he possesses enough intellectual initiative to attempt something in the way of scholarly and creative effort. The habit of placing research and teaching in juxtaposition, as though they prefigure competitive demands on a college professor's time and interest, is unfortunate; for time devoted to research may well be time given to the invigoration of instruction.

6. ARE CRITERIA OF GOOD TEACHING PRACTICABLE?

Nevertheless it is apparent that good teaching, in the commonly accepted sense of the term, can not be placed on a parity with conspicuous success in research, as a basis for promotion and advancement in salary, until some dependable ways of discovering the really good teacher are worked out. Nearly every college professor believes himself to be a good teacher, in fact a particularly good one. There is no way of convincing him to the contrary; at any rate the colleges have as yet devised none that he is ready to accept as conclusive. Both good and poor teaching are for the most part left to make themselves known through campus gossip and other such casual channels. What is needed, therefore, is the setting up of some systematic plan whereby the quality of teaching can be determined in a more dependable way.

The committee believes that the working out of criteria by which effective teaching can be recognized is a matter for local self-determination, but with due regard to such standards as national organizations may from time to time set up. This should be done by individual departments or by groups of related departments, each for itself and in its own way—and by all members of the department or group in co-operation, not by the department head or heads alone.

The starting point in this matter should be the proposition that good teaching ought to produce results in the students. These results provide a field for measurement. College teachers have been examining students in one way or another for at least five centuries. Today there is being developed an art of examination and a technique of testing which should be recognized by every college department as potential roads to the discovery of the good teacher and his consequent reward. To test students is to test teachers. It follows that in framing criteria of good teaching dependence must be placed upon progress in the art of

examination. Hence comprehensive examinations, external examiners, and new type tests have a close relation to this problem.¹

In recommending that departments and groups of departments, or divisions, give serious attention to this matter the committee realizes that no simple formula for the easy recognition of good teaching can ever be devised, whether by examinations or otherwise. No scheme of mechanical ratings or tests will serve to accomplish the end. For even as the ultimate aims and purposes of instruction differ from college to college, from department to department, and even from course to course within the department, so the methods used in the evaluation of good teaching must vary. Whatever arrangement is adopted at any institution should therefore be flexible enough to meet the varying conditions under which it must be applied.

7. THE RATING OF TEACHERS BY STUDENTS AND ALUMNI

During recent years a number of institutions have endeavored to discover the good teachers on their staffs by calling upon undergraduates or recent alumni for their judgment. Questionnaires have been sent inquiring about the quality of the teachers' work. It is the committee's belief that the almost universal failure of these rating experiments has been due to the use of untactful and injudicious procedure. Student criticism and ratings ascertained by presidents, deans, or even by heads of departments without the advice or consent of the teachers concerned, have not proved fruitful of good results and are not likely to do so. But such criticism or ratings obtained for the information of the instructor, in accordance with a procedure which he approves, are likely to be advantageous to him.

The committee is of the opinion that much could be accomplished for the promotion of better teaching if college administrators would provide departments from time to time with a reasonable appropriation to facilitate a self-study of their own work. Such an appropriation, however, should not be tied down by any condition that the inquiry must be conducted in a specified way, or that it shall be undertaken by outsiders, or that either students or alumni must have any part in it. The teachers within a department or group of allied departments are the ones best equipped to pass judgment upon the efficiency of one another's work provided they are given facilities for ascertaining the facts and for testing the results in a systematic way.

8. TEACHER TRAINING FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS

The committee is not prepared to recommend that any requirement of courses in education be established as a qualification for college teaching.

¹ See pp. 32, 33; 91-96.

It has discovered on this matter a wide divergence of opinion between teachers of academic subjects on the one hand and teachers of education on the other. Some reconciliation of these divergent views is greatly to be desired, for the committee believes that improvements in the technique of teaching can best be secured by cooperation between the educationists and the academic group in an endeavor to reach common ground. Hence, while not prepared to recommend that, under present conditions, those who are preparing for the profession of college teaching should be required to take formal courses in education, it nevertheless feels that institutions of higher education should direct an adequate amount of effort toward ensuring among members of their staffs a proper understanding of the whole educational system of the United States.

The present situation in the field of teacher-employment, moreover, is such that many students who are preparing to teach in colleges find it to their advantage to take courses in education in addition to the subject-matter courses which they are pursuing. It therefore becomes a matter of importance to determine what such courses in education ought to be. Consideration should accordingly be given, both by academic departments and by departments of education, to the development of a body of instruction which would be adapted to the needs of those who, while preparing to become college teachers, feel it advisable to equip themselves with the professional qualifications for a secondary school position in case a college appointment does not materialize.

On the more general question of teacher-training for college teachers the committee, while recognizing the present undeveloped state of the field of teacher-training at the college level, recommends that the following practices be followed to the extent that they are found compatible with the transcendent importance of a thorough training in subject matter:

- (a) That the academic departments give consideration, in whatever ways they think best, to methods of teaching and to teaching under supervision.
- (b) That they sanction a seminar on problems of American education, with special reference to the college, to be given by the school or department of education alone or in cooperation with the academic departments, this seminar to be optional for students who are preparing to become college teachers.

An additional step, moreover, the committee is prepared to suggest to universities and colleges at the present stage; namely, that when a department's personnel is large enough, and where students are being prepared to become college teachers, there ought to be in the department

at least one member who is especially interested in the problem of teaching. It should be his duty to take the lead in promoting the discussion of teaching methods within the department; he should be the adviser of those students who expect to enter the profession of teaching; and he should make himself familiar with their teaching experience and capacity. Such a member of the department might also be expected to interest his immediate colleagues in the gathering of materials and the working out of a procedure whereby the effectiveness of their own teaching could be by themselves determined.

9. THE TEACHER'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY

College professors sometimes forget that they are expected to function in a threefold capacity. First of all, they are counted upon to increase the student's interest, develop his intellectual capacity, and expand his knowledge. They also share in the duty of widening the bounds of learning by their own research and scholarly exploration. And they have the third obligation of participating in the direction of collegiate educational policy. It is their task to determine what shall be taught in the colleges, as well as how, and to whom. College faculties decide the qualifications for admission to college, the scope and nature of the curriculum, the standards of student scholarship, and the requirements for graduation. Furthermore, in determining the policies and practices of the colleges, members of the staffs of institutions of higher education exercise a far-reaching influence upon the secondary schools. College teachers should be fully alive to their obligations in this regard. This high responsibility of educational leadership has not always been understood and discharged by members of the teaching staffs of colleges and universities.

What is needed, therefore, is the pursuit of studies which will accomplish three things: *First*, to make accessible to college teachers generally the newest developments in higher education presented in relation to the whole organized plan of education in the United States; *Second*, the development of proper methods of testing results and the gathering of materials with reference to the methods of instruction by all departments such as will enable criteria of good teaching to be worked out; *Third*, the vigorous study of everything that can throw any light on the processes of learning by college students.

In the opinion of the committee one of the fundamental questions which ought to have the attention of the entire membership of the Association at the present moment is this: Are the active teachers of the academic subjects (who are the ones most concerned with the effective teaching of these subjects) ready to assert their leadership and to participate in the discussion of how these subjects can best be taught,

or are they going to sit on the side-lines and leave the whole discussion to administrative officers, professors of education, and officials of educational associations?

That such matters will be discussed, studied, written about, and generalized upon by somebody is inevitable. The question is by whom and from what point of view. Accordingly the committee desires to emphasize as strongly as it can the duty and obligation of the whole profession to acquaint itself, and to encourage its younger members to become acquainted, with the general organization of education in the United States and with the distinctive problems of higher education, to promote every investigation which seems likely to result in our knowing more about the processes of learning, and to work out wherever practicable some plan which will enable the teachers in each department to determine whether they are really attaining the ends which they may agree upon as desirable. In such matters the counsel and cooperation of members of departments and schools of education can be of real value.

College administrators frequently complain that many professors become so engrossed in their own special fields of interest that they look at the broader problems of education too narrowly. If so, it behooves college administrators to encourage the discussion of educational problems at meetings of their faculties. There is a feeling, at some institutions, that the administrative authorities do not welcome the full and frank expression of professorial opinion on questions of general policy. Local chapters of the American Association of University Professors should also plan to devote some of their meetings to a discussion of timely issues connected with college organization, policy, and methods. This would be of especial value to the younger members.

10. ASSISTING THE TEACHER IN SERVICE

Poor teaching is occasionally due to a failure on the part of the teacher to realize what is expected of him. Some institutions have found it advantageous to give new instructors a certain amount of perspective in the aims and routine of the place, pointing out what to do and what to avoid. This may be done by putting mimeographed material into their hands or by arranging conferences with older members of the staff. Deans and heads of departments should make it easy for new instructors to obtain the counsel of their older colleagues, but the latter should be careful not to give this guidance in a way that will dull the young teacher's own initiative.

Some advantage can be devised from the practice of having experienced teachers visit the classes of their younger colleagues from time to time and subsequently making suggestions which look to the improvement of instructional methods. It conduces to the successful working of

this arrangement when the visitation is informal and by previous understanding with the younger teachers. In other words success or failure depends upon the spirit in which the visiting is done. If used merely as a means of checking up upon an instructor, it is likely to be disturbing and unsatisfactory; but if the purpose is to help with friendly and constructive suggestions, the practice seems to bring beneficial results. Formal visits to college classrooms by presidents, deans, and other administrative officers ought to be avoided, even though motivated by good intent, because they are likely to be misconstrued by both instructors and students.

More advantageous than visitation of the usual type is the practice of having younger teachers visit classes taught by older members of the faculty who are known to be effective teachers. The committee has found this practice to be very little followed, although its value is almost universally admitted. In large institutions, where the elementary courses are divided into sections, and also meet as a whole in occasional lectures, it is likewise desirable that each young instructor in charge of a section should be given a few opportunities to appear before the class as a whole.

The committee also recommends that staff conferences or regularly organized seminars attended by members of allied departments (or, in a large institution, by members of a single department) be held for the discussion of instructional problems. Mention should likewise be made of the value which comes from the exchange of teachers between institutions.

11. SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF GOOD TEACHING

Special awards primarily for good teaching are provided at a few institutions. At Wesleyan University, for example, and at the University of Chicago the recognition takes the form of substantial increases in salary for the teachers selected. While the committee believes that a good deal can be accomplished for the stimulation of good teaching in this way, it feels that salary provisions for superior teaching should be made in the form of permanent advances and not merely to continue for a short term of years or during the pleasure of an administrative officer or board.

Good teachers are sometimes induced to give up all or part of their classroom work in order to become members of the administrative staff. The acceptance of an administrative position is occasionally expedited in such cases by the expectation of an advance in rank or compensation. It is proper that deans and other administrative officers should be rewarded in this way, but the committee feels that the recognition awarded to good teaching, as such, should be of sufficient certainty so that no

successful instructor need feel himself constrained to become an administrative officer in order to secure the advancement which he deserves.

12. THE TEACHER'S SECURITY OF TENURE

It is sometimes contended by college administrators that the relative security of tenure which professors enjoy is the mainspring of much poor teaching. Teachers who have obtained a permanent appointment sometimes become indifferent to their classroom obligations; they go stale and lose their enthusiasm; yet they rest secure in their positions because of a feeling that the American Association of University Professors will intervene in their behalf if any attempt is made to dismiss them.

This point of view betokens a complete misapprehension of the Association's policy, attitude, and traditions. The purpose of this organization in urging security of tenure is to promote the best interests of higher education in America. It urges security to the extent that it will promote these interests and no farther. The American Association of University Professors is not primarily a protective organization. It has no desire to protect the incompetent in the ranks of the professoriate. During the twenty years of its existence it has intervened in no case to urge the retention of any teacher whose inability or disinclination to fulfil his obligations to the institution has been apparent. But it does stand firm against any dismissal of permanent appointees on the alleged ground of incompetence when the real reason appears to be something else. The Association merely asks that a statement of the grounds for dismissal be given with due notice and opportunity for a fair hearing.

It may be that even this reasonable requirement sometimes stands in the way of the college administrator's freedom to weed out the inferior teachers from the faculty. But it is well to remember that security of tenure for the competent professor or associate professor, which every one seems to desire, cannot be purchased without price. Any arrangement which is effective in giving peace of mind to those professors whom a college strongly desires to retain must inevitably afford shelter for an occasional teacher whose retention is not so clearly desirable. It is the belief of the committee that a free hand in the dismissal of any teacher whom the college administration is minded to dismiss would break the morale of faculties and would result in poorer rather than better teaching.

On the other hand it is essential that institutions be encouraged to assume a large degree of liberty in protecting themselves against the enforced retention of teachers who have been appointed for a stated term and have not proved satisfactory. A few years ago a committee of this Association recommended that the tenure of instructors and as-

sistant professors be definitely limited.¹ If teachers in these ranks do not prove themselves worthy of promotion at the end of their terms they should not then be continued on permanent tenure. But when they are promoted (with a presumption of permanence), there is an implication of security which should not be lightly disregarded.

13. NON-TEACHING ACTIVITIES IN THEIR EFFECT UPON TEACHING

Among members of the Association there is no appreciable complaint concerning too much committee work. In most institutions this work is well distributed and does not constitute an undue load upon the teacher's time. Rotation in committee service is desirable in order to prevent such an overload. The rotation in office of deans and of heads of departments is also worthy of consideration wherever such an arrangement can be utilized to prevent the permanent loss of a really good teacher from full-time teaching work.

The burden of extension work gives rise to some complaint, but in exceptional cases only, although in many instances it is said to interfere with the research work and other scholarly pursuits of college teachers. Unremunerated work closely related to a teacher's field of scholarship, such as editing of a scientific journal, or the presidency of a learned society, should be encouraged within reasonable bounds because its reactions upon the spirit of the teacher are likely to be beneficial. Allowance ought to be made for it, if necessary, in his schedule of teaching hours.

A note of caution should be sounded, however, with reference to some phases of unremunerated work which college professors are nowadays expected to do as a matter of service to their institutions. College administrators ought to have the fact impressed upon them that time devoted to community service in the way of public addresses and so forth is usually subtracted from the time needed for the professor's task of teaching and for other scholarly activities.

At some institutions there are teachers who engage in a considerable amount of remunerated outside employment, such as serving as industrial consultants or as advisers to public bodies. Such work, if extensively carried on, may prove a serious distraction from the teacher's primary task. This problem, however, is not a serious one in most institutions and the committee believes that it may well be decided between the individual professor and the administrative authorities rather than by general rule applying to all members of the faculty.

14. THE PROPER DETERMINATION OF THE TEACHING-LOAD

With respect to the teaching-load, the committee agrees with the general opinion, held by members of the Association, that this ought not

¹ Report of the Committee on Methods of Appointment and Promotion, published in the *Bulletin of the Association*, vol. xv, pp. 175-217 (March, 1929).

to be stated as a definite number of classroom or laboratory hours per week regardless of the amount of time needed for preparation, or for committee work, extension courses, correspondence courses, service to the community and the other obligations imposed upon the teacher. Every schedule ought to be a matter of flexible adjustment, but definite understanding, between the professor and the head of his department or the dean. In this connection the committee ventures to mention the desirability of dealing leniently with new instructors wherever practicable so that they may have ample time for the proper preparation of their classroom work. Failure to achieve high standards of teaching, especially on the part of instructors who are new to the work, is sometimes due to their not having adequate time for preparation. The current maximum of sixteen classroom or laboratory hours per week, set up by the North Central and other accrediting associations, should be regarded as a maximum for experienced teachers who have no non-teaching obligations.

15. DIVIDING LARGE CLASSES INTO SMALL SECTIONS

Everywhere there seems to be a settled conviction among college teachers, college students, and college administrators that teaching can be better done in small classes than in large ones. The idea has been pressed so far, in some cases, that small groups of undergraduates are tacitly assumed to be better taught by young, immature instructors or teaching fellows than they would be if they were thrown into larger classes taught by older and more experienced members of the faculty. Opinions as to the superiority of the small section over the large class seem to be firmly and widely held irrespective of the subject which is being taught or the maturity of the students concerned.

This conclusion, however, does not as yet appear to rest upon any basis of results actually tested and ascertained. No careful study of the subject, so far as the committee can discover, has thus far demonstrated that the splitting of large classes into small sections of twenty-five students or less is worth the large expenditure which this practice entails. It is quite possible, of course, that this failure to prove the superiority of the small section method is due to the inadequacy of the studies which have thus far been made. Or it may be that the method has certain values of an imponderable nature which can not be measured by any kind of formal result testing.

The committee is not ready to venture any opinion on the main issue. It does, however, call attention to the fact that the widespread belief in the superiority of the small class method has not been fortified by any adequate investigation of the actual results. The matter is one which ought to be thoroughly studied, teacher by teacher and subject by

subject, before the present policy of small group instruction becomes stereotyped through the planning of classroom buildings.

Such a study might conceivably show that the plan has marked advantages at the hands of some but not of others, and in the teaching of some subjects but not in the teaching of others. It might indicate that the advantages are greater, or less, in elementary than in more advanced courses. It might indicate that the small section method is not of any considerable value to the best students but that the so-termed "remedial sections" for small groups of poor students are well worth while. In laboratory courses, moreover, it is obvious that the size of classes or sections will frequently be determined by the facilities and equipment available rather than by the methods of teaching. Assuredly the matter deserves a full and fair exploration, for unless it can be demonstrated that instruction can be given with distinctly better results in small groups than in large classes, the great expenditures now being made by universities and colleges to maintain the former method of instruction have no justification and are merely serving to hold down the scale of professors' salaries.

The committee recommends that college faculties or local chapters of the Association make a special study of this matter to ascertain just where increases in the size of college classes can be made with the least detriment to the interests of instruction, whether in elementary or in advanced work, whether in some departments but not in others, and whether some compromise through the substitution of lectures for a part of the classroom discussions, without replacing them entirely, can be worked out to advantage under the stress of present conditions. The results of such studies might then be assembled by a committee of the Association.

16. SECTIONING ON THE BASIS OF ABILITY OR ACHIEVEMENT

Experience with the practice of sectioning students according to their scholastic rank appears to show that it is excellent for the best students, satisfactory for the middle group, but not always of advantage to the lowest group of students. There is a general feeling among college professors that sectioning should not be carried so far as to have three groups, because both good and poor students do better when working with average students than when segregated by themselves.¹ In any event the arrangement should be such as to permit students to be moved from one group to another at any time. This, however, is a difficult matter in some institutions because of inflexibility in the schedule of classroom hours.

¹ This is somewhat at variance with the views expressed, ten years ago, in the Report of the Committee on Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates, published in the *Bulletin* of the Association, vol. ix, pp. 275-290 (October, 1923).

17. COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS AND EXTERNAL EXAMINERS AS AIDS TO GOOD TEACHING

An exhaustive study of this subject has recently been made under the auspices of the Association of American Colleges by Professor Edward S. Jones of the University of Buffalo.¹ Many institutions use the term "comprehensive examinations" but it includes all sorts of examinations, some of which are not comprehensive in anything but name. Sometimes the examination covers little more than a single course. More often it includes within its scope a group of courses without additional reading, and occasionally it covers both courses and reading assignments. Harvard has had the longest and most extensive experience with comprehensive examinations (known there as general or divisional examinations), but at Harvard the plan is linked with an elaborate and expensive system of tutorial work.

The discussion of comprehensive examinations in the volume by Professor Jones is so inclusive that teachers who desire to make themselves familiar with the subject may well be referred to this volume. The success of the plan depends upon the program of work leading to the examination, the way in which the tests are administered, and the amount of guidance given to the students in preparing for them.

Examiners from other colleges have been used at a few institutions in connection with their comprehensive examinations. The committee believes, however, and experience seems to indicate, that most of the benefits arising from the use of external examiners can be obtained without requisitioning them from outside. The essential thing is that the examiner shall be external so far as the particular class or instructor is concerned. He need not be external to the institution or even to the department in which the examination is being taken. The ends can be served by having the comprehensive examinations prepared by a committee from the department or a group of departments.

18. NEW TYPE TESTS AS A MEANS OF IMPROVING COLLEGE TEACHING

The committee has found much student-criticism of the kind of examinations commonly used in college courses and of the existing system of grading the results. The so-termed new type or objective tests have been looked upon in some quarters as a means of improving the situation but thus far they have been used for the most part in departments of education only. There the results are favorably and sometimes even enthusiastically regarded. Some academic departments have also found the new type tests advantageous in connection

¹ *Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges*. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933. 436 pp.)

with the improvement of teaching in their elementary courses, and the American Council on Education is now preparing a series of new type examinations in a large number of subjects.

A continuance of experimentation with these tests, especially in elementary courses, is regarded as desirable, and in this work the assistance that can be secured from professors in departments of education will undoubtedly be of value. The time is now opportune for such experimentation on a considerable scale because the economic pressure on the colleges has involved a diminution in the number of assistants, especially in the larger courses. This means that there will be difficulty in securing a careful reading and grading of conventional examinations. The new type tests can be handled more rapidly and with less dependence upon the examiner's own knowledge of the subject.

19. ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING

It is recommended that in every university and college faculty there be a special or standing committee on the improvement of instruction. Its function should be to keep in touch with this problem especially as it concerns the elementary courses, to encourage the trial of new and hopeful methods by individual instructors, and to make the faculty conversant with such of them as seem to be successful. This plan, it is believed, will prove more efficacious and will engender less friction than would result from the appointment of a dean or director of teaching. Interdepartmental conferences for the discussion of teaching problems and for the interchange of ideas relating to them should be held occasionally and the frequent selection of special faculty committees for the study of new instructional methods is a practice which ought to be encouraged. Visiting professors, moreover, should be invited not only by reason of research reputations but because of ability to exemplify high standards of teaching efficiency.

20. EXPERIMENTS WITH NEW METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

Universities and colleges are giving earnest attention to the problem of stimulating undergraduate interest by new methods of instruction, especially by those which throw more of the responsibility for his education upon the student himself. Hence college teaching, during the past twenty years, has been moving steadily toward the greater individualizing of instruction. The trend is still strongly in that direction and on the whole it seems to be justified by the results although there is some doubt in college faculties as to whether the new methods of individualized instruction have a value commensurate with the great increase in cost which they sometimes involve. These new devices

include honors courses, independent study courses, "group major" programs, preceptorial and tutorial systems, conference plans, free periods for reading, and so forth. All of these have had their origin in a belief that the regular routine of classroom work does not provide a sufficient challenge for the best students and that even for students who are not so good there should be an adaptation of college work to their individual needs and abilities.

So much has been published concerning these newer provisions for independent study and individualized instruction that no extended explanation of them seems to be needed here. No one of them has yet passed beyond the experimental stage. In most instances there is no convincing way of measuring the results. The data from which success or failure might be demonstrated are fragmentary and subject to differences of interpretation. For example, the fact that students obtain higher grades in independent study courses than in their regular classroom work does not of itself prove anything unless one can be certain that the same standards are maintained in both. The fact that great advantage seems to be obtainable from a well-organized and expensive tutorial system leaves unanswered the question whether as much might not be obtained by expending the same amount on the improvement of teaching in the classroom.

The committee hopes that this process of experimentation may be continued, but so far as practicable under such controlled conditions as will enable their success to be determined by other than purely subjective assurances on the part of those connected with them. It believes, moreover, that institutions should be cautious about adopting plans or methods which are extensively advertised as successful but which have not been so demonstrated by any impartial survey. No mechanical devices can assure the effectiveness of college instruction if the standards of admission are low, the equipment poor, the library facilities inadequate, the professors overworked and underpaid, the curriculum well studded with "snap" courses, and the atmosphere of the campus pervaded by an overemphasis on athletic and social activities.

It is the firm conviction of the committee that neither now nor in the future can any single plan, method, or device of instruction be safely recommended to the universities and colleges of the United States for use by them in all departments and under all circumstances. This makes it all the more essential that each institution, and indeed each individual teacher, shall earnestly strive to ascertain, by experimental processes, the methods that seem to attain the best results in individual cases. For no two colleges are alike in their organization, purposes, resources, traditions, or problems. Nor are any two instructors alike in their background, competence, versatility, or personal qualities.

A method which proves successful in one case may fail in another. The success or failure of an experiment in college teaching depends almost entirely upon the environment in which it is given a trial and on the men who are responsible for it. Methods can not be divorced from men and atmosphere.

It is unquestionably desirable that experiments with new instructional methods shall be aggressively carried on, but without expecting that scholastic miracles will be wrought by any or all of them. For when all is said and done, there can be no substitute for the capable student and the competent teacher in the process of effective education.

PART III

GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS

1. THE PURPOSE OF TEACHING

At the very outset of their discussions the members of the committee found themselves confronted with certain fundamental questions which are not easy to answer, if indeed they are capable of being answered at all. What is the mission of the American college? What is the principal objective in the teaching of college undergraduates? From that point of view what constitutes good teaching? How can it be defined? How can it be differentiated from poor teaching?

It is sometimes said that research in America is alive and stimulating, while college teaching has been relatively lacking in both life and stimulus. If this be true, what is the reason for it? To say that research has been enthusiastically recognized and rewarded, while teaching has not, does not seem to provide the whole explanation. Does the college teacher, as such, have a clear conception of what he is trying to do, or indeed of what his institution is seeking to do? Assuredly many students who come to college, and many parents who send their sons and daughters there, appear to have beclouded notions concerning the true collegiate function. Going to college has become, in many cases, a social gesture. Students who come in that spirit make the achievement of good teaching extremely difficult.

For what is good teaching? Obviously it is the kind of teaching which inspires the student to take an active part in the educational process, in other words inspires him to educate himself rather than to expect that someone else will do it for him. Regarded from that point of view there are many types of good teachers and of good teaching. To teach is to lead, and there is no end to the varieties of leadership. Any teacher who gains the desired end, who induces self-education on the part of his students, is an effective teacher no matter what his methods or personal attributes may be. To attain this end, however, certain qualifications on the part of the teacher are essential or desirable, and much has been written concerning the qualities which a good teacher ought to possess. Some attempts have been made, indeed, to list these attributes in the order of their importance. For example, the rating-scale devised at Oberlin College gives the following as the ones which ought to be considered in appraising the good teacher:¹

1. Breadth and richness of his courses in respect to content.
2. Organization of his courses (efficiency in the planning and the

¹ Association of American Colleges *Bulletin*, vol. xv, p. 76 (March, 1929).

- general conduct of his courses).
3. Clearness in explanation and in illustration.
 4. Getting the student's point of view.
 5. Skill in eliciting and directing discussions.
 6. Care in assignment of papers and other collateral work, and adequacy of consideration of the same.
 7. Accessibility for consultation.
 8. Interest in students as individuals.
 9. Stimulating the student to his highest level of achievement.
 10. General influence on student morale.

At the University of Chicago some eight years ago a study of the attributes of a good teacher was made by a student-faculty committee, the results of which were subsequently published.¹ Knowledge and organization of subject matter was placed first; skill in instruction was given second place; and personal qualities were rated as third in order of importance. In 1930 a group of 177 students at Oregon State College made a report upon the desirable qualities of teachers. Here again a thorough knowledge of the subject matter was given first place; knowledge of methods was given tenth place in the list of qualities, being preceded by personality, neatness, fairness, sympathy, sense of humor, interest in the profession, and other qualities.²

A dozen other endeavors have been made to secure agreement on the qualities which a good teacher ought to possess, but the only generalization that can be safely made from them is that a thorough knowledge of one's subject is the *sine qua non* of effective teaching. All things else are ancillary to this. Unless a teacher has mastered his subject he cannot hope to inspire his students with much zeal for their own progress in it. It is also true, however, that the possession of this mastery does not itself guarantee success in a teacher's classroom. The term personality, which covers a multitude of things, is often utilized by student committees to prefigure a quality upon which they place a great deal of emphasis. Other more specific qualities are also listed by them as exceedingly desirable. For example, the habit of selecting the materials of a course with care, organizing it so that the sequence of topics is natural and clear, preserving a proper balance in the emphasis on different topics, pointing out the relationship between the course and other subjects, getting the student's point of view, stimulating his intellectual curiosity, conducting discussions skilfully, showing a sympathetic attitude toward the class and endeavoring by experiments to improve the methods of conducting the course—these and a dozen other items of personal equation and tech-

¹ *School and Society*, March, 1925.

² *School and Society*, November 22, 1930.

nique are commonly listed as ones which conduce in varying degrees to teaching success.

It is significant, however, that no two investigations in this field seem to arrive at exactly the same results. The qualities which are ranked high in some cases receive a lower rating in others. This would seem to indicate that aside from a mastery of his subject the essential and semi-essential qualities of a good teacher vary from one institution to another, and from one subject to another. They also appear to be related to the maturity of the students concerned. Qualities which are regarded as the most essential attributes of a good teacher in elementary courses often find themselves placed low in the scale as respects advanced instruction. Skill in the presentation of a subject, for example, becomes less vital as the students progress in maturity. When a teacher really knows his subject the graduate student can usually worm it out of him, but the undergraduate is not likely to incur the trouble involved. Hence a student will sometimes testify that his worst teacher and his best teacher were one and the same man—worst as a lecturer in a large freshman course and best in handling a small group of seniors doing advanced work in the same subject.

So nothing would seem to be more futile than an attempt to define good teaching, or the qualities of a good teacher, by laying down a set of formulas which would apply uniformly to all institutions, subjects, teachers, and student groups. In the Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges for March, 1929, there is a discussion of "Great Teachers" by Dr. Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary of that Association. It embodies the outcome of an attempt to discover what qualities the admittedly great teachers in a large number of American colleges have displayed. No fewer than one hundred and eleven admirable traits were reported by college administrators, professors, students, and alumni as accounting for success in the case of those whom they regarded as great teachers. In other words the qualities which make for good teaching seem to be as numerous and varied as are the teachers themselves.

2. THE QUALITY OF COLLEGE TEACHING TODAY

Outside academic circles, and sometimes even within, there is a definite impression that college teaching does not represent a high level of effectiveness. The existence of such feeling within the colleges is shown by the large number of experiments now being carried on in the hope of improving the quality of undergraduate instruction. Some of the outside criticism comes from those college graduates who have become convinced, after a failure to make good in the world, that there must have been something lacking in their college training and hence

that their teachers must have been in various ways to blame. Some of it comes from educational researchers who occasionally seem disposed to assume that teachers who have had no professional training in education must inevitably suffer from the lack of it. And more of it, perhaps, has come from those who are not familiar with the notable progress which American colleges as a whole have made during the past generation in the quality of their teaching.

If even half the allegations that have been made concerning the shortcomings of college instruction were true, the situation would assuredly stand in need of remedial measures. College professors are charged with teaching too much, or too little, as the case may be. They are said to be researchers, not interested in students, inaccessible, without human sympathy; their courses are alleged to be badly organized, or to require from their students too much work, or too little work, or the wrong kind of work; their lectures are reputedly dull; they tell too many stories and waste their students' time, or they tell no stories and hence are utterly lacking in a sense of humor; they have too little enthusiasm for their subjects; they are deficient in tidiness, in orderliness, in punctuality, in personality, in ability to remember names or faces, in worldliness, in versatility, in voice, or in whatever else they ought to have.

One might make a very extensive catalogue of professorial frailties, for both educationist and popular magazines are full of them. But no evidence is ever adduced to prove that college professors as a class are more conspicuous in their shortcomings than are judges, lawyers, doctors, or high school teachers, not to speak of artists or actors. Some of the criticism arises because college teachers are judged, in the main, by those much younger than themselves. Hence overmuch is expected of them.

Inevitably a good deal of poor teaching is tolerated in universities and colleges, as in schools and seminaries. That goes without saying. Every profession or vocation has its quota of deficients. Neither the student body nor the faculty constitutes an exception to that rule. But the idea that the teaching which is done at the college level is for the most part poorer than that done in high schools, graduate schools, or professional schools is the outcome of guesswork. It rests on no basis of ascertained fact or well-sifted opinion. The real question, moreover, is not whether college teaching is good or poor, but how much better it can be made in view of the difficulties which it frequently encounters.

Some of these difficulties are connected with the great expansion in college enrolment which has taken place during the past twenty years. The number of students in our universities and colleges is

more than twice what it was two decades ago, and there is every reason to believe that this great expansion in the size of the student body has involved some deterioration in the general level of undergraduate competence. Rapid expansion usually means dilution. To that extent it increases the difficulties of good instruction. The raw material with which the colleges now have to deal is larger in amount and according to professorial testimony it is not better in intellectual quality than it was a generation ago.

This growth in student enrolment, moreover has necessitated a large expansion in the teaching staffs of universities and colleges. Faculties, like student bodies, have more than doubled since 1913. So great an increase in the teaching staffs could hardly be accomplished without some lowering of the qualifications for collegiate positions. Especially during the years 1922-29, there was a "seller's market" for the products of American graduate schools and the supply of well-qualified college teachers proved to be rather unequal to the demand. This being the case, many whose qualifications would not have assured them places in college faculties under normal conditions made their way into the profession of college teaching. Their presence there accounts for some of the inferior teaching, the onus of which is being laid at the door of the entire professorial fraternity.

Moreover the rise in the remuneration of college teachers during the era of the great upsurge (1922-29) did not keep pace with the increased earnings of men in other professions. This was partly because the revenues from new endowment which ordinarily would have been available for increasing salaries were too often expended in multiplying courses or in reducing the size of classes. This policy of dividing large classes into small sections involved the employment of many additional instructors. Hence the increased size of teaching staffs, all over the country, absorbed much of the new revenue which otherwise would have been available for a greater increase in professorial salaries.

Likewise much of the money that came into the college treasuries during these years was designated by its donors to be used in the erection of new buildings. As these buildings were not usually endowed, the maintenance of plant and structures became a large and ever-increasing burden upon the general college budget. Administrative expenses also piled up with the increase in college enrolments and the need of exercising a more paternal supervision over the less studious portion of the undergraduate body. Thus funds which might have been used to strengthen the appeal of the teaching profession to the more promising youth of the land were often consecrated to more or less solicited purposes.

Something must also be attributed to the fact that the prestige which

college professors enjoyed in earlier days has undergone a noticeable decline. One reason, perhaps, is that they have become so much more plentiful. Their profession has lost its monopoly value. Likewise the profession may have suffered from the partial eclipse of scholarly ideals by the economic materialism of the past generation. Mammon, it is to be feared, attracted more worshippers than Athene in the days when greenbacks were plentiful. The true scholar, of whom Chaucer said "gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche," has had all too few to do him reverence in the era that we have been passing through.

When due allowance is made for these difficulties, both practical and psychological, there is reason to feel that the general standards of college teaching in the United States have been, on the whole, commendably high. Unfortunately, when any one takes issue with this assertion, there is no convincing way of substantiating it. For college teachers have as yet devised no systematic means of having the results of their own work fairly evaluated. They have worked out no objective way of determining whether their work is good or bad.

The college teacher plans his own course and gives his own instruction; at the end of the term he prepares his own examinations, tests his own students, and renders his own verdict upon what he has accomplished. He looks on his handiwork and says that it is good. This self-appraisal of results is not checked by any one else. The students may think him a good teacher, or a poor teacher, or they may be undecided. If they call him a good teacher he cordially agrees with them; otherwise he suspects that they are themselves to blame, and consoles himself with the thought that undergraduates are not competent to pass judgment on a teacher's efficiency anyhow. That is why most college teachers look upon themselves as good teachers, even though intimations to the contrary may now and then reach their ears. To secure improvements in any man's work it must first be demonstrated that his work needs improvement. Colleges have as yet devised no recognized way of doing this to the teacher's satisfaction.

Yet the problem does not seem to be one of insuperable difficulty. Every college course presumably has some end or ends in view. If it were not so, the course would hardly be offered. Presumably, also, this goal can be ascertained and defined. Obviously the end in view will not be an identical one in all institutions, or in all subjects, or as respects instruction given to students at all stages of academic maturity. Nearly ten years ago a committee of the Modern Language Association undertook to formulate and state the ends that are sought to be attained in the teaching of a foreign language. As the outcome of their study they declared "ability to read a foreign language" the first and most important objective in an elementary course. Ability to under-

stand the spoken language was placed second, and ability to speak it the third, while ability to write it was given fourth place.

Of course these objectives of instruction would have no relation to work in history, mathematics, or science and may not be agreed to by all teachers of modern languages. Each branch of the curriculum has its own purposes; there are as many primary and secondary ends in teaching as there are subjects to be taught. Moreover, the goals may be quite different within the same subject as respects elementary and advanced instruction. But each of these can be ascertained, and when this has been done it constitutes the first step on the way to the establishment of some means whereby the efficiency of the teaching in the individual course or subject can be measured.

3. THE ATTRACTION OF SUPERIOR PERSONNEL TO THE PROFESSION

Of course there is a danger that any systematic effort to seek out and reward the good teacher may result in placing undue emphasis on teaching technique and may lend countenance to the idea that "imparting knowledge" is the good teacher's sole function. Good teaching in the colleges is not merely a matter of methodology carried over from the lower schools. It is one of kindling the inner fires. Hence no improvement in the technique of instruction, however great it may be, will prove of enduring service unless the flow of recruits into the profession is restricted to those who combine scholarly competence of a high order with an inspiring personality.

This raises the question whether the profession of college teaching has been drawing enough young men and women of such caliber into its ranks during the past twenty years. However relevant this question may be, it does not lend itself to a confident answer because there are no reliable data on which an answer can be based. There is a widespread impression, however, that the profession of college teaching has not been making a sufficiently strong appeal to the best young minds of the nation. Among undergraduates who leave our colleges at every Commencement season with the highest scholastic rank, and who possess in addition the strongest personal qualifications, it is well recognized that too small a proportion are disposed to look upon college teaching as an eligible or attractive career.

On the other hand our graduate schools find themselves overstocked with young men of undistinguished ability and indifferent personal traits who are diligently grubbing their way to the doctorate with the expectation that places on college faculties will be found for them. A very substantial percentage of those who by dint of patience and industry succeed in getting the doctor's degree offer no reasonable promise of ever becoming eminent as scholars or notably successful as

teachers. They do not possess the keenness of mentality which qualifies for the one or the attributes of leadership which are needed for the other. To be sure, our graduate schools do attract a good many young scholars of the highest quality, but they find themselves mingled with others in whom no discernible indications of intellectual brilliance are to be found.

Now if it be true that the profession of college teaching is not making a sufficiently strong appeal to the best young minds, what is the explanation? One sometimes hears it said that many students of good, but not uncommonly good, ability are lured into the graduate schools by a liberal policy of granting scholarships, free tuition, loan funds, or other aids. Young men who have just received their baccalaureate degrees often find themselves confronted with the alternative of earning their own way through a professional school or going to a graduate school with the aid of a generous subsidy. For the graduate schools have relatively a much larger number of these financial aids to give out. It is a question sometimes raised, and worth raising, whether educational generosity in the promotion of candidacies for the Ph.D. degree has not been carried too far. It has helped to overstock the market and to lower the monetary value, as well as the prestige of this degree.

More frequently, however, it is argued that the relatively modest scale of salaries paid to college teachers has deterred the ablest young men from entering the profession. This argument has been extensively used in campaigns for college endowment. It loses some of its force, however, when one observes that young men of independent means, who do not have to take account of professional earnings in their choice of a career, seem to be relatively scarce among those who enter the ranks of college faculties. One writer has suggested that the trouble lies deeper—that it goes back to the general American attitude towards scholarship and earning power. "The great majority of young men go to college" he says, "not for mental growth and attainment, but to make money-earning machines out of such mental equipment as they may have." Having fitted themselves in this direction they see no reason why they should enter a profession which offers no likelihood of personal enrichment.

Certain it is, at any rate, that the young man of exceptional ability who chooses the vocation of college teaching in the United States must surrender his hope of gaining affluence when he does it. He must even be prepared to forego the degree of worldly comfort which would probably be his if he chose some other career. So long as this continues to be the case it may be feared that the ablest and most ambitious young college graduates will not be drawn into college teaching in any

adequate number. They will go into law, or business, or banking, or journalism, or into other fields in which outstanding competence is assured of adequate financial recognition.

Fortunately, however, there are many features of the academic life which give it agreeableness in spite of the monetary handicaps. There will always be some young Americans to whom the opportunity of pioneering into new domains of knowledge will make a compelling appeal. Likewise the daily contact with congenial colleagues, the relative security of tenure, the long vacations, the sabbatical arrangements which exist at many institutions, the incentives to intellectual self-improvement, and the chance to do public service of the highest order—these attractions of a professorial career will never be altogether despised by young men whose true sense of values enables them to differentiate between the gold and the glitter of life. The profession of college teaching must continue to make its principal appeal to those who realize that the chief end of man is not the mere accumulation of worldly riches. The balance sheet of a happy life can not be cast in figures. Counters of a more spiritual nature are needed, and some imagination to add them up, as well.

An inquiry addressed to one hundred and sixty-one colleges by the Association of American Colleges a few years ago asked this question: "What are you doing to enlist your best students for college teaching?" It brought from about half of them the reply that they were pinning their faith on the graduate schools by encouraging their best students to go there. In addition a considerable number reported various forms of sporadic personal evangelism on the part of their faculty members.¹ But little is done by the colleges in any systematic way. They should realize, however, that the college is the primary source of enlistment for college faculties.

The rigidity of the requirements for the Ph.D. degree maintained by most of the graduate schools is sometimes said to deter many promising students from resorting to these institutions. These requirements, we are told, are better suited to the industrious plodder than to the young man of intellectual genius who is so often an individualist and does not take kindly to curricular routine. Such men sometimes shrink from entering upon a three or four years' course of graduate study which is largely mapped out for them in advance and which therefore affords little scope to any one who wants to follow his own bent in his own way.

This is because the graduate schools have taken over from the colleges a considerable part of the mechanized supervision of student work which is found in most undergraduate institutions. There is reason

¹ Association of American Colleges *Bulletin*, vol. xv, pp. 55-56 (March, 1929).

to believe that if the graduate schools of the United States would offer young men and women of exceptional ability a greater degree of freedom from routine requirements in their progress toward the Ph.D. degree, the appeal to the exceptional might become a good deal stronger. The provision recently made at Harvard University for a Society of Fellows is intended to afford a selected group of young scholars, who are not candidates for any degree, the most complete freedom to make progress in their own way and prove their abilities without the necessity of meeting any routine requirements whatsoever.¹

Fundamentally, however, the appeal of any profession is determined by the men who are already members of it. Hence the real question is whether the college teachers of today are portraying by their own careers and example to the younger generation of scholars the kind of profession which strikes the youthful imagination in a favorable light when compared with other callings. Are the college professors of America, by their way of life, their enthusiasm for their own calling, their zeal in the pursuit of truth, their versatility, and their display of public spirit, striving earnestly to enhance their profession in the public respect? Or have some of them too freely displayed the now-familiar supercilious attitude of pretending that students are a necessary evil and that teaching is a bore? May it not be true, and if true, unfortunate, that college professors have been rather too much given to talking about themselves as overworked, underpaid, harassed by administrators, restrained in their freedom of speech, threatened in their tenure, and generally treated as a sort of intellectual proletariat? Perhaps there is need for less of this self-deprecation. A learned profession will be taken by the world at the price that it places upon itself.

In any event the durable satisfactions of the teaching profession, in its higher ranks, ought to be vigorously and consistently presented to the world and more especially to young scholars whose qualifications for entering it are conspicuous. An equally vigorous and sustained effort should be made to discourage those whose promise of success in the profession is at all doubtful. No one should enter the vocation of college teaching, if urgent advice can dissuade him from it, unless he is endowed with a genuine liking for the scholar's life. If a man's ideals and temperament incline him to look upon teaching as a mere means of earning a livelihood, his service as a teacher is not likely to be successful, much less outstanding. Too many such teachers, it is to be feared, have found their way into the classrooms and laboratories of the country.

The problem of keeping college faculties free from those who have small likelihood of ever becoming creditable members of the profession ought not to prove difficult during the next few years when the number

¹ An outline of the organization and purposes of the Society of Fellows is printed in the *Bulletin*, of the Association, vol. xix, pp. 274-275 (April, 1933).

of applicants for teaching positions in universities and colleges is likely to be far in excess of the demand. College administrators will have the opportunity to bestow their preferences on candidates who, besides possessing high qualifications in their special subjects, are endowed with breadth of cultural background and with those other qualifications which help to make them real additions to the collegiate circle. And in determining whether to select or reject an applicant they will do well to keep in mind the fact that a high-powered intellect is not the sole passport to success in this vocation. Character and ideals, a sense of obligation to the quest for truth, a capacity to be a cooperating inspiration, and a genuine interest in youth are also factors of great importance.

4. PRESENT FACILITIES FOR THE SELECTION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

In the course of his visits to institutions throughout the country as Field Director of the present survey Professor Homer L. Dodge found considerable dissatisfaction with existing facilities for the selection of college teachers. This feeling is not so apparent at some of the larger institutions, especially at those which place the main emphasis on research when seeking additions to their faculties. Men who have demonstrated ability and promise as research scholars are easily located. But in the smaller colleges there is a strong feeling that the facilities now open to them for the selection of capable teachers are quite inadequate. Presidents, deans, and heads of departments in these smaller institutions believe themselves to be seriously handicapped in their search by the fact that no practicable way has been provided for finding out where the good teachers are located and who among them would be available for new appointments. Men in different fields of learning do not, for the most part, come together at meetings of scientific associations as teachers but as researchers and writers of books.

Hence when a college wants a new instructor or assistant professor the usual practice is to make inquiry at one or more graduate schools. This is sometimes done by the college president, but more often by the dean or the head of the department concerned. In any event the inquiry goes to those graduate schools with which the inquirer happens to be most familiar. When the request is received it may be given personal attention by the recipient, or it may be turned over to an appointment office, or it may go to some member of the appropriate department, usually a junior member, who has been designated to take care of such inquiries.

In any event the graduate school will usually recommend someone who has just completed his work for the doctor's degree and has shown

promise in research by writing a good thesis. Two or three such men may be recommended. Occasionally the head of the department in the graduate school will suggest some young instructor from his own departmental staff for whom there seems to be no immediate opportunity of promotion. There is a frequently encountered suspicion in the colleges that the large universities are sometimes not above ameliorating their own necessities in this way.

Occasionally also, but rarely, the graduate school will suggest someone who has been out teaching for a few years and has asked to be recommended for a better position when the opportunity arises. Teachers in graduate schools do not naturally turn to the men who have become well-settled in small institutions where they have demonstrated a high degree of usefulness. These forgotten men may be first-rate teachers and thoroughly worthy of consideration for more important posts, but they are overlooked because they are deemed to be securely placed and the problem of finding positions for the newer products of the school is a more urgent one.

Several years ago a committee of the American Association of University Professors made a special study of this matter and found a great deal to criticize in the existing practice.

"The present arrangements and methods," they declared, "do not discriminate between the ordinary man and the man of exceptional talent. They proceed on incomplete knowledge of the appointee. They take into consideration too small a number of applicants. They overlook men of talent who are engaged in inconspicuous institutions. They are based on inadequate or narrow theories of education. They do not systematically promote scholarship. They employ no definite standards of qualification. They increase the exercise of autocratic power in the hands of a few. They pay too little attention to the personal qualifications of the candidate."¹ This indictment, as well as the complaints which have come forward in the course of the present survey, suggest earnest consideration of the ways in which the facilities now available to small colleges for the selection of good teachers may be improved.

The Appointment Service, maintained by the American Association of University Professors and now in its fifth year of operation, has aimed in a measure to meet the needs of this situation. Members of the Association are given opportunity to file their applications at the Washington office, and college administrators are encouraged to use the lists of men whose names and qualifications are kept on file. Vacancies and available applicants are also announced in each issue of the Association's *Bulletin*. It has been suggested, however, that this Appointment

¹ See above, p. 19 (footnote).

Service ought to be developed to a point where it would become of much greater importance among the Association's activities. More specifically it has been urged that the Association ought to maintain, in connection with its Appointment Service, a permanent field representative whose duty it would be to go from college to college inquiring about prospective vacancies on the one hand and obtaining information about teachers of unusual competence on the other.

Such teachers would not be merely listed. Their qualifications would be brought to the personal attention of those who have vacancies to fill. With a proper organization for this work and a thoroughly capable man in charge of it, the Association would presently be recognized by college administrators and heads of departments as an impartial and reliable agency of nation-wide scope to which they might turn with confidence for information in the matter of new appointments. The cost of the service, it is suggested, should be borne by the Association and not by those who receive the appointments through its offices, although a small registration fee might properly be charged. The duty of helping properly to recruit its own ranks is one that the profession owes to itself. To carry out such a plan would involve an additional expenditure of ten or twelve thousand dollars a year. This, unless funds could be had from some outside source, would necessitate raising the membership dues of the Association by an additional dollar, making them five dollars per annum instead of four as at present.

Some more adequate way of making vacancies known to the whole profession has also been urged. In Great Britain the practice of publishing announcements of vacant academic positions and inviting applications therefor is one of long standing. Such announcements are commonly inserted in the professional journals and there is nothing undignified about this procedure, although it is said that applicants are sometimes undignified in their hunt for testimonials wherewith to bolster up their applications. In the United States the colleges have been reluctant to do anything of this sort. For a number of years, however, the *Bulletin* of the Association has carried lists of vacant positions and of men available for positions, in both cases without giving names, and no criticism of this practice has been encountered. The proposal now is that universities and colleges be urged to go farther and announce their vacancies not only in the *Bulletin* but in such publications as the *American Mathematical Monthly*, the *American Historical Review*, the *Classical Journal*, *Science*, and similar periodicals which devote attention to various fields of the curriculum.

Such announcements, it is suggested, should specifically state the qualifications that are required and should invite applications from those who come definitely within such limits of eligibility. They should

make clear that applicants are asked to do no more than send an outline of their qualifications and should stipulate plainly that no testimonials are to be sent until asked for. This would forestall the serious objections to which the plan has laid itself open in Great Britain. It may be that such announcements would bring a flood of applications from persons who are wholly unqualified; but without giving the method a fair trial there can be no certainty that this would be the outcome. Meanwhile, in the absence of formal announcements there is a great deal of scouting around for advance information by commercial teachers' agencies which virtually sell information concerning these vacancies to their clients. It would be an advantage to the profession if such agencies could be deprived of their monopoly as respects appointment opportunities. They charge commissions, relatively high commissions, for telling teachers what all of them ought to be told without having to pay for it.

Most college professors are of the opinion that it ought to be perfectly respectable for a college to announce a vacancy on its staff, and equally respectable for any qualified man to make application for it. Educational foundations, such as the National Research Council and the Social Science Research Council, advertise that they have fellowships to award and invite applications. They do not appear to be swamped with letters from the wholly ineligible. It is quite in order for the ablest young scholars to apply for these fellowships. So with respect to teaching fellowships and assistantships in the larger colleges and universities. Regular application blanks are sometimes provided in such cases. There is a fairly general impression among members of the Association that the plan of announcing vacancies in the journals of learned societies would be worth trying.

One sometimes encounters the complaint that the graduate schools too frequently urge upon the appointing authorities of the colleges a list of candidates whose proficiency in their advanced studies is indisputable but who have had no experience in teaching and who offer no promise of ever becoming good teachers. They pay little or no attention, it is said, to the qualities which the colleges regard as of the utmost importance, hence many misfits find their way into the faculties of the smaller institutions—men who find that teaching is not an agreeable occupation and who should have discovered this fact before entering the profession. This criticism of graduate school recommendations is rather freely voiced by college administrators, yet the figures do not indicate that it is altogether well-founded. For the number of young men and women who complete their work in the graduate schools without having had any experience in teaching appears to be so small as to be almost negligible.

Professor John J. Coss of Columbia University, for example, has compiled the results of an inquiry into the training of the young men and women who received their Ph.D. degrees at that institution in 1930. Of the ninety-seven who replied to his inquiry it was found that ninety-five had had teaching experience. Investigations conducted at the University of Minnesota in 1928-29 showed that all the recipients of the Ph.D. degree from that institution in the academic year mentioned had been in service as teachers, the average duration of it being about five and one-half years. Professor Edgar Dale found that 90 per cent of all those who received the Ph.D. degree at the Ohio State University were persons with from one to ten years' experience in teaching; and in 53 per cent of the cases this experience had been in colleges or universities.

Of course the question may be raised whether teaching in an elementary or secondary school gives an adequate basis for predicting the success or failure of the same teacher at the college level. Probably it does not, although there are some who contend that the qualities which make for success in the teaching profession will uncover themselves irrespective of the maturity or immaturity of the pupils concerned. And in any case it would appear that a very substantial percentage of those who receive their doctor's degrees from the graduate schools are persons who have had experience in college teaching as teaching fellows, assistants, laboratory demonstrators, instructors, or assistant professors.

Unfortunately there seems to be little or no checking-up of this experience by professors in the graduate schools before they recommend candidates or by the college authorities before they make their selections. Faculty building is probably the most important problem that college presidents have to wrestle with. To succeed in this is to succeed in the most difficult of all presidential responsibilities. Yet it is surprising how frequently the executive head of a college depends in such matters on the head of a department while the latter, in turn, merely accepts the judgment of somebody at one of the graduate schools. This judgment is rarely based upon any personal knowledge of the candidate's probable effectiveness as a teacher, nor can it well be, for although professors may know that the person who is being recommended by them has been a college teacher somewhere, they do not know whether he proved himself a good teacher nor have they any means of finding out unless they go to more trouble than professors in graduate schools are customarily disposed to take.

The Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, appointed by the Association of American Colleges (President E. H. Wilkins, Chairman) gave careful attention to this matter in 1929 and

strongly recommended that departmental heads in graduate schools should "regard it as a part of their task to acquaint themselves with all readily ascertainable evidence as to the teaching ability of their graduate students," and that "college officers seeking new instructors from among graduate students should make insistent inquiry of graduate school representatives with whom they deal as to the training and experience of the candidate with respect to teaching."

These recommendations deserve to be reiterated. Bringing to the attention of small colleges only those who give definite promise of being able to teach well is an obligation which the graduate schools ought to look upon with genuine seriousness. It is a responsibility which they owe to the interests of the profession as a whole. Graduate schools ought not to recommend any man for a college teaching position solely on the basis of his scholastic record in graduate courses, or his skill in research, or his promise in the way of productive capacity regardless of his probable competence for the work which the college is primarily employing him to do. Failing other evidence it would be well for the recommending authorities to put their candidate into an undergraduate classroom for an hour or two, just to see how he gets along. This would not be a conclusive test, but it would at least save the colleges from some of the worst misfits that have been put upon them. It has also been suggested that every candidate for the Ph.D. degree should be required to give at least one lecture to an elementary course and to conduct a discussion class for one hour under observation by a regular member of the university staff. This observer would then report his judgment of the man's teaching capacity.

Many graduate students also serve as teaching fellows or assistants. It would not be a difficult matter to ascertain whether their work in such capacities has measured up to expectations. But most graduate schools do not take any special pains to secure this information. If it were somebody's business to make himself conversant with the teaching competence of these young men, and to place his ratings of them on record for the use of his colleagues in the graduate school, the probability is that greater discrimination would be used in recommending them to other institutions.

Not all the responsibility for placing poor teachers in the colleges, however, can be thrust back upon the graduate schools. The appointing authorities in the colleges are entitled to their share of it. They ask for the wrong thing, very often, and then complain because they get what they ask for. They insist on considering none but those who have attained the Ph.D. degree, although well aware that this degree is professedly conferred on candidates who have shown "unequivocal capacities for research" and conveys no assurance that the possessor has

demonstrated any indications of skill as a teacher. Rarely do college administrators ask the graduate schools for the ablest man in any branch of a subject; their almost invariable request is for someone whose training and interest have been in a designated branch of the subject. They do not usually ask the graduate school for the best available man in any field of English literature, for example, but for a man who would be competent and interested to give a course in the English drama, or on the history of the American novel, or in public speaking, as the case may be.

When a college desires an addition to its department of history, to take another illustration, it does not customarily ask the graduate school to send along the name of its most promising young man in any field of history with the expectation that some day he will make an outstanding place for himself, even though his immediate interest may not fit the momentary needs of the college curriculum. On the contrary the college authorities almost always specify in such case that they want some one who has had his special training and has written his thesis in the field of medieval European history, or modern American history, or economic history, or some other special domain of history. Hence a thoroughly first-rate young historian may be passed over in favor of one who, although by no means so capable intellectually, appears to be better prepared to undertake immediately such specific instruction as is needed to fill a departmental gap.

This way of doing things is made virtually essential by the collegiate tradition that certain courses must be given, whether first-rate teachers can be obtained to give them or not. Such a point of view is unfortunate in its long range results. It has brought into college faculties many men of commonplace intellectual endowments who happen to have concentrated their graduate work in a special field just prior to the appearance of a vacancy that synchronized with it. It has riveted too much attention upon courses and too little upon men. Heads of departments in small colleges, when they insist that the competence of an instructor to offer a certain course is the essence of his appointment, should not be surprised if this results in their getting an instructor whose chief claim to favorable consideration is that he fits the small slot which has been chiselled for him. When college administrators complain that the graduate schools do not send them young men of exceptional teaching ability, broad cultural background, versatility of interest, and agreeable personality they should remember that these are not the things that they have insisted upon—except as supplementary to what they have prescribed as the prime essential.

And in any event most colleges do not usually make their selections on a basis of graduate school recommendations alone. Sometimes they

take the precaution of having a representative of the college arrange personal interviews with several of the most promising candidates before a final choice is made. These interviews are supposed to provide information concerning the general appearance and personality of the applicants. While they are doubtless of considerable value in some instances they are far from providing an adequate safeguard against ill-advised selections. For every applicant tries to make a good impression on such occasions and unless the interviewer is a man of marvelous perspicacity he cannot get the measure of his prospect in the course of a twenty-minute conversation.

Of even less service than the personal interview is the practice of asking applicants to forward their photographs so that these can be studied as a means of reaching a decision with physiognomy as the handmaid of intuition. Repeated experiments have disclosed that three or four deans or heads of departments, when set to rate the photographs of a dozen applicants, invariably arrange them in a wholly different order of merit. There is only one way of making sure that a young man is going to prove himself a good college teacher, which is by giving him a trial. Hence the desirability of making all initial appointments of young instructors for one or two years only.

5. THE RELATION OF TEACHING TO RESEARCH

"College teaching can be improved by a decrease in the over-valuation of published research as the main measure of a teacher's worth" writes one successful college president. This assertion embodies an idea that is somewhat widely held in circles of collegiate administration. It betrays a feeling that many college professors devote too much time to research because college administrators over-value it as a measure of the teacher's service to the institution. Good teaching, we are often told, should be recognized and rewarded on its own merits without reference to what the teacher does or fails to do in his non-teaching hours.

Yet it is idle to profess any such special solicitude for the good teacher when existing conditions are such that a man's success in research is everywhere rewarded as a matter of course, while success in teaching is not. No difficulty is ever encountered in finding out whether a scholar is successful in his creative work. There are plenty of criteria wherewith to settle that question. The results of his research get published in books or in scientific periodicals. He is honored by election to membership in one of the recognized academies or made an officer in some learned society. He is invited to read papers at meetings of these bodies. His research work draws favorable comment from scholars in the same field elsewhere. When any young teacher, no matter where

he may be located, makes a noteworthy contribution to one of the professional journals, he at once attracts the attention of men in the larger institutions. Presently he gets a call to some better post than the one that he is occupying, whereupon his own college, in order to hold him, counters with an advance in rank or salary. He becomes a full professor before his time. Hence the saying that "research gets itself automatically rewarded."

But good teaching, no matter how good it may be, has no such advantage. It rarely gets recognition outside the bounds of the campus concerned. Those who publish nothing usually remain unhonored and unsung by the world of scholarship outside. Men who write well but teach badly often make their way rapidly to the head of their profession; their names are listed among the *savants*, while those who teach well but write badly are usually overlooked even by such a compendious directory as *Who's Who*. The good teacher's colleagues in other and larger institutions seldom hear of his achievements because there are no recognized channels through which information concerning his teaching prowess can be conveyed to them. Hence it almost never happens that a teacher in a small college is called to a post in one of the large universities when he has accomplished little in the way of publishing the results of his research. Hence it is, also, that young scholars who desire to gain recognition as leaders of their profession are virtually driven to do research work whether they want to do it or not. As one of them remarked not long ago: "I wrote that book because I found it easier to do a piece of research than to keep everlastingly explaining why I didn't."

All this explains, in part at least, the considerable amount of indifferent research that is being turned out by men in academic circles. The pressure, unfortunately, sometimes comes from above. At one institution it was reported that the president would not raise the salary of any professor who did not publish at least three papers a year, whereupon one man published the same paper in three different places and thereby gained his advance. Heads of departments, even in small colleges, are often very reluctant to recommend for promotion any of their junior colleagues who do not "produce something." It need not be of high quality—almost anything with the young man's name on the title page will sometimes do.

So it is with college presidents, for the most part. When they say that they are unconcerned whether members of their faculties do research work, they do not always mean this in a literal sense. Their annual reports point with pride to the list of faculty publications, however slender it may be. Of course the younger members of the teaching staff are not blind to the implications. They know that while promotion

will come in due course to the man who does his classroom work well, it arrives more expeditiously in the case of those who attract outside attention by their research work and their writings. Having a staff of strong research men gives prestige to any institution, large or small, and college presidents realize it. For this prestige they are willing to pay.

So it is not enough to give mere lip-service to the proposition that good teaching should be on a parity with successful research as a basis for promotion in rank and advancement in salary. This parity can not be maintained in the two activities unless outstanding success in the classroom is given some recognized channel through which it can be made manifest. If success in research were left to impress itself upon the mind of the college community through the gossip of undergraduates and the chance remarks of alumni it would frequently fail to be appreciated. Teaching ought not to remain under this handicap of having no agreed upon means of fair evaluation. For so long as that situation continues it is inevitable that research and other non-teaching activities will be used, more extensively than they ought to be, as the measure of a teacher's value to his college.

What has been said in the foregoing paragraph, however, does not imply that men who devote much of their time and interest to research are necessarily poor teachers. The two activities are by no means inharmonious; on the contrary teaching and research can, and usually do, supplement each other to their mutual advantage. Teaching gives direction to research. Research gives vitality to teaching. It is not an end in itself but the manifestation of an alert, inquiring, and inspiring mind. When classes are conducted by one who is not interested in any form of creative activity the proceedings in his classroom or laboratory are apt to drift into a dull routine. No teacher who does not himself possess the urge of a pioneer into new and unexplored domains of knowledge can communicate anything of this spirit to his students. No man can be a really great teacher if he brings, year after year, no rejuvenating element into his own intellectual life. It is true, of course, that the outstanding scholars in the field of research are not always the most effective teachers of undergraduate classes; but on the other hand it is equally true that the great majority of ineffective college teachers are guiltless of any original contributions to the field of productive scholarship.

The tendency to regard teaching and research as unrelated and somewhat competitive preoccupations, each competing with the other for the professor's time and energy, is not unknown among college administrators. Some years ago at a small New England college one of the teachers wrote a small book and had it published. Proud of his accom-

plishment, which was somewhat rare in that particular college, he gave the president of the college a complimentary copy of the little volume with a neat inscription on the flyleaf. "It must have taken a good deal of your time to gather material and write this book," suggested the president. "Yes, it did," was the reply. "It took all my spare hours for nearly two years." "Well in that case," came the retort, "it seems to me that if you have time to write a book you have time for an additional half-course in your teaching schedule."

There are not many college administrators who look at the productive strivings of their teachers in that light, and fortunately so, for the professor who gives a reasonable share of his time to the right kind of research is really devoting it to the invigoration of his capacity as a teacher. He is keeping himself intellectually fit. Taking the country as a whole, the best teaching is done in those institutions where the atmosphere is surcharged with a vigorous interest in all forms of creative activity on the part of the teaching staff.

6. ARE CRITERIA OF GOOD TEACHING PRACTICABLE?

Any college president will tell you, if you ask him, that his faculty contains some good teachers and some who are not so good. He will further assure you that he knows which are which. But if you press him for a detailed explanation of methods whereby he is able to pick out his good teachers with such unerring certainty you will usually find that he has no regular way of doing it. President Eliot of Harvard used to discover his good teachers by looking over the final examinations which they expected their students to answer. He believed that this would at least give him some idea of what each teacher expected from his students, and it was the Eliot philosophy that a teacher who expected little was probably getting it.

Most college presidents, according to their own admissions, do not go to that small amount of trouble. How, then, do they know who their best teachers are? In the main they rely on what they hear now and then from heads of departments, or from students, or from recent graduates, or from others who may be more or less in touch with campus chatter. Because of this rather fortuitous way of arriving at presidential conclusions it is not improbable that many good teachers who do not give large or popular courses go unrecognized year after year, while others who possess themselves of an easily acquired undergraduate popularity get a higher rating than they deserve.

If this be so, even to a slight degree, is it not advisable to attempt the working-out of some criteria whereby the differentiation of good teaching from poor teaching in the minds of college administrators could be put on a just basis? If the end which a teacher is seeking to reach

is agreed upon, and if the attainment of this end is made manifest in the progress of his students, does it seem altogether impracticable to devise some systematic way of determining whether one teacher is more successful than another in reaching it? The students who study under a competent teacher ought to be the better for it. Their gain is measurable, or it probably can be made so by refinements in the art of examination.

The Committee on College and University Teaching, in the course of the present survey, reached the unanimous conclusion that progress in this direction ought to be diligently sought, and that the initiative should be taken by college teachers themselves. The task should not be relegated to college administrators or to educational researchers. If the quality of the teaching in any college course is to be evaluated, it is imperative that teachers who are doing the work shall have an all-important share in deciding the methods whereby it is done. As a practical matter this means that the problem is one for self-study in each institution by the individual departments or by groups of departments or by inter-departmental faculty committees as may seem most advisable in individual cases.

But how would the members of a department, or group of departments, proceed to work out a plan for differentiating the good from the poor teachers within their own ranks? The answer is that the procedure should be wholly a matter of local self-determination. Self-studies have been made, and are being made, by departments or groups of departments at a number of institutions. When such surveys are seriously undertaken it is not long before some interesting and significant things come to light. These form the basis for a further exploration into the facts and the figures. At Yale University some years ago, for example, a tabulation was made showing the general scholastic average of the students enrolled in undergraduate courses. This compilation disclosed that there were certain instructors whose elective courses regularly drew a large proportion of low-grade students while there were others whose instruction appealed mainly to undergraduates of high scholastic rank. Of itself this fact did not afford conclusive proof of poor teaching in the one case and good teaching in the other, but it created a presumption which merited further investigation.

It raised the question whether one can usually find the best teachers by following the best students. Usually, perhaps, but not always. The nature of the subject, the rules governing the choice of elective courses, the hours at which the courses meet—these and other considerations have to be taken into account. A professor of Greek whose class meets at eight o'clock in the morning will not draw many American undergraduates even though he be the best teacher in the world, while a pro-

fessor of elementary economics, whose course meets later in the day and is a prerequisite for all other work in the social sciences, is likely to attract a large congregation, including many high-grade students, no matter how indifferent the quality of his instruction may be. Something must also be allowed for the fact that even good students are frequently not above accepting the opportunities for relaxation which a poor course so often provides.

No simple formula such as finding the best teachers by following the best students will suffice. Criteria of good teaching, if they are to serve their purpose, must be worked out carefully by the teachers to whose work they are to be applied. They will differ from one department to another. Doubtless they will be rather crude at the outset but by the process of adaptation they can be improved. Probably they will lean heavily upon progress that has already been made in the art of devising a comprehensive examination which tests the student's grasp of a subject rather than the amount of information that he has obtained in an individual course. At any rate it is here—in the field of examination rather than of classroom technique—that the most promising opportunities for a marked improvement in the general standards of college teaching seem to exist.

7. THE RATING OF TEACHERS BY STUDENTS AND ALUMNI

In the absence of any systematic plan, agreed upon by teachers, whereby their own competence in the classroom can be fairly determined, some college administrators have tried to satisfy themselves on this point by using the cruder and simpler method of having the teachers "rated" by students or by alumni. They have not done this because they believed it to be the best way but because there did not seem to be any other way. The usual procedure has been to have someone in the school or department of education prepare an elaborate questionnaire for transmission to all members of the student body or to the younger alumni. Samples of these questionnaires are given in the Appendix.¹

Most of these experiments with the plan of student and alumni ratings have resulted in failure, partial or complete. This is not wholly because college teachers as a class resent the idea of having themselves criticized or evaluated by their students or former students. Some college professors there are, of course, who believe that a certain sanctity attaches to the lecture desk, a sort of halo that no undergraduate should have the temerity to penetrate. Others feel that student and alumni ratings, while possessing a certain value, constitute a poor basis on which to determine faculty promotions. But most teachers have no objection

¹ See pp. 111-117.

to student or alumni ratings in principle; they merely object to the way in which the plan is usually worked out.

In other words the failure of these rating experiments has been more largely due to defects in the procedure than to the shortcomings of the plan itself. For one thing the questionnaires have been framed and sent to undergraduates and alumni without the advice or consent of the teachers concerned. Hence there have been vigorous protests against the kind of questions which are sometimes asked. For example:

Does his general scholarship seem to be of a high order?

Does he know what he is talking about?

Is his scholarship in his special field adequate for the job?

Many college teachers argue, with good reason, that the categorical *Yes* or *No* of a college undergraduate on such questions is of scant value and is certainly not worthy to be taken as a basis for determining an instructor's value to the institution. It is small wonder that they feel misgivings when assured by an exponent of this method that "subtracting the average adverse criticism of a given class on all these questions from 100 per cent gives a single measure of the general strength of the teacher's technique."¹

Experience, therefore, has repeatedly shown that student criticism and ratings ascertained by heads of departments, deans, or presidents through the use of formal questionnaires stir up resentment in faculty circles and usually do more harm than good. Information as to the competence of college teachers which these officials are seeking can be obtained in more tactful ways. Rarely is anything to be gained by using a method which engenders so much suspicion and hostility as this formal rating of teachers by students appears to have done in almost every case.

On the other hand no such objections apply to criticism or ratings obtained from students or alumni for the information of the instructor and by means of a questionnaire which he approves. Many college teachers throughout the country regularly solicit such criticism from their students and ask for suggestions to improve the effectiveness of their teaching. This practice ought to be encouraged by the administrative authorities and the encouragement may take one of several forms. For example, the administration may provide the clerical assistance which will enable an instructor to make his own inquiries. It might well go farther and facilitate the making of self-surveys by departments or groups of departments with an understanding that the ascertaining of student or alumni opinions may be part of the project.

¹ *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. ii, pp. 313, 315 (June, 1931).

Liberal appropriations are frequently made by the governing boards of colleges for research projects in the customary sense of the term. But very few such grants are ever given to faculties or departments to facilitate research into the results of their own teaching work. Appropriations devoted to this purpose, when requested by college teachers of the academic subjects, would in all probability represent money well spent. It is most desirable, however, that such grants be made without explicit condition that any specified procedure be followed in conducting the investigation. It is the essence of sound research, in this as in other fields, that it shall be free and untrammelled.

Too much reliance, in any event, should not be placed upon student opinion with respect to the quality of the teaching that is given to them. For occasionally a teacher achieves a high place in the estimation of his students by doing most of their work for them, by solving all the difficult problems, and by making the subject matter of his course so clear to them that no appreciable intellectual exertion on their own part is demanded. When knowledge comes easily there are some students who put this down as the result of good teaching. To locate the easy teacher is a matter of simple arithmetic, but he often turns out to be a poor teacher. Undergraduates, moreover, are prone to be unduly influenced by a teacher's personal appearance, his mannerisms if he has any, his interest in their student activities, and other things which have little or no relation to the real effectiveness of his classroom work. Frequently it happens, moreover, that students do not appreciate, until years after they have gone out into the world, how much they owe to certain teachers whose work did not impress them as undergraduates.

What has been said of criticism and ratings by students applies for the most part to the younger alumni as well, although their opinions with reference to teaching efficiency will obviously be more mature than are those of undergraduates. Everything depends upon the spirit in which their judgment is asked, on the motives behind the request, and on the cooperation which the faculty is induced to give in the matter. Under favorable conditions, with the whole procedure tactfully and wisely planned, the ascertaining of alumni judgment may prove advantageous to the teachers concerned. Yet, when all is said and done, the fact remains that a professor's colleagues are better equipped to judge the efficiency of his work than any group of students or alumni can possibly be, provided, however, that these colleagues are minded to set about doing it in a thorough and systematic way. The trouble is that they have not tried to do it in that fashion. Indeed they have rarely tried to do it in any fashion. The way to get rid of student and alumni ratings is to devise something more satisfactory in their place.

8. TEACHER TRAINING FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS

The most highly controversial of all the issues encountered in the course of the present survey can be stated in this way: Is it likely that courses in education, if taken by those who are preparing to become college teachers, will result in an improvement of college teaching?

This question has come into the forefront of educational discussion in recent years for two reasons. In the first place, the requirement of courses in education has become virtually universal in the case of all those who seek credentials as teachers in public high schools and sometimes in junior colleges as well. An elaborate report on *Required Courses in Education*, prepared by a committee of the Association and presented at its last annual meeting, indicated the scope and nature of these requirements.¹ In some parts of the country the state university is the only public institution of education in which anyone can teach or hold an administrative position without having pursued a designated program of professional courses in education, including usually the history of education, educational administration, educational psychology, and practice teaching. Such requirements are established by law or by the rules of the state department of education. There is some apprehension among the rank and file of college teachers that the next step will be the urging of a similar requirement for all those who seek to be appointed to the faculties of state universities.

Such a step may seem to be rather remote, but when one bears in mind the ease with which this requirement of courses in education was extended from the high schools to the junior colleges in some states, its extension from these institutions to the lower divisions of the state university would seem to be by no means an unthinkable contingency. The usual curriculum of a junior college, as is well known, parallels the first two years of undergraduate work in a state university. Already educationists have raised a query as to the logic of permitting "untrained" instructors to teach freshmen and sophomores in the state university when such instructors would not be eligible to teach students at the same level in junior colleges.

There is, of course, no logic in that situation. If the junior college movement spreads, as seems likely, and if the requirement as to teachers' credentials is generally extended to all such institutions, as is also likely, it is by no means improbable that pressure will be exerted upon the state universities to exact similar qualifications from those whom they appoint to their teaching staffs.

In the second place, the question has been brought to the front by the fact that although college teachers are not now required to

¹ This report, in condensed form, is printed in the *Bulletin* of the Association, vol. xix, pp. 173-200 (March, 1933).

take courses in education as part of their preparation for teaching, many of them in fact do so. This is because most young men and women who are planning to enter the teaching profession do not know during the course of their preparation whether they can find college positions or whether they will have to be content with something lower in the academic scale. And even when they definitely expect to become college teachers many of them find it necessary to engage temporarily in secondary school teaching as a means of earning money to complete their graduate studies. Under existing conditions, therefore, the graduate student who intends to become a college teacher is providing himself with an anchor to windward when he takes those professional courses in education which have been prescribed as essential to the securing of a teaching credential under the state laws or regulations.

So whether courses in education are required or not as part of the preparation for the Ph.D. degree, the fact remains that an increasing number of prospective college teachers are likely to take such courses for practical reasons, and this wholly irrespective of the high or low value which these courses may possess. Moreover, the likelihood of their taking such courses will doubtless increase during the next few years because of the great uncertainty as to the number of college teaching positions which will become available. It is highly improbable that the universities and colleges of the United States can make immediate places for any large fraction of the young men and women who are now enrolled as candidates for the doctorate. This means, of course, that many of them will have to teach in secondary schools and junior colleges if they teach at all. Such being the case, a large number of prospective college teachers will undoubtedly deem it wise to equip themselves with whatever credits in education are needed to give them eligibility for appointments in the public school system.

With these various considerations in existence and in prospect, the question as to what courses in education are likely to be of largest value as a preparation for college teaching becomes an important one. It is a practical problem which can hardly be brushed aside in cavalier fashion by teachers in the academic departments. If it be true that many prospective college teachers are going to take courses in education for practical reasons, wholly apart from any appraisal of their value, it would seem worth while to consider what courses they ought to be counselled by their academic advisers to pursue. Can work in the department or school of education be so planned that it will not only qualify for a secondary school credential but will also be of real value in case the teacher who takes such work eventually finds his way into a college faculty? That question is one with respect to which the

academic and educationist points of view should be drawn into some degree of harmony.

At present these views seem widely apart. In the course of its inquiries the Committee on College and University Teaching found that there are three categories of opinion with reference to the value of courses in education so far as the preparation of college teachers is concerned. At one extreme there are some educationists who believe and urge that courses in education ought to be required in the case of everybody who expects to hold a teaching position of any sort, anywhere. Courses in education, or "teacher-training courses" should be taken, they argue, by everyone who hopes to be a good teacher at any level from the kindergarten to the graduate school. Accordingly they would make such courses an absolute requirement in connection with every candidacy for the Ph.D. degree inasmuch as most of those who aspire to that degree are qualifying themselves to become teachers.

The arguments advanced by those who hold this point of view have become familiar through long-continued reiteration at educationist conventions. College teaching, it is said, is not only a science but an art—and proficiency in an art requires special training. No matter how well a man may know his subject he is not likely to become a good teacher of it unless he has been trained in the technique of teaching. It follows, therefore, that if the great majority of those who take the Ph.D. degree in our graduate schools expect to become college teachers, they ought to be given "professional" as well as academic preparation, and the degree should not be awarded to anyone until he has proved his competence satisfactorily along both lines. There are some, indeed, who go so far as to urge that the preparation of college teachers should be undertaken mainly, if not wholly, by schools of education rather than by the graduate schools of universities. To this end they advocate that subject-matter departments should be developed in colleges of education paralleling similar departments in the colleges and in the graduate schools.

Those who hold to the foregoing point of view have presented a great mass of data in support of it. They point to the results of various investigations which have been made in different parts of the country and by various organizations, the results of which are asserted to indicate the high desirability of courses in education as part of a teacher's training. For example, a questionnaire sent to the presidents of one hundred and eighty-five sectarian colleges by the executive secretary of the Association of American Colleges a few years ago asked the following question: "Do you prefer to have college teachers with educational training?" One hundred and seventeen of these colleges gave an unequivocal Yes and only twenty-two responded with a straight negative; the remainder

answered the question with various qualifications. Inquiries conducted by the North Central Association and other accrediting bodies are cited as pointing to a similar conclusion. Educationists believe that they are on firm ground when they assert that not only are courses in education of demonstrable value as part of the college teacher's preparation, but that heads of educational institutions are coming to a clear recognition of this fact.

At the other extreme is the traditional academic point of view. The discussions which took place in connection with the visits of the Field Director to local chapters of the Association and at the last annual meeting of the Association appear to indicate that this attitude is shared by the great majority of teachers in the subject-matter departments. They hold staunchly to the opinion that formal courses in education have little or no value as part of the college teacher's training. Their specific criticisms are that these courses in education are now too numerous and too thin, that there is a great deal of repetition in them, that much of the material is of trivial consequence, and that the methods used in "practice-teaching" courses are less effective than are those used in the regular classrooms by the general run of academic instructors.

Furthermore they point rather jubilantly to the fact that instruction given by teachers in departments or schools of education is not generally regarded by the student body, nor has it been demonstrated by any valid tests, to be of better quality than that given in the academic courses by teachers who have had no formal training in educational psychology or in the methods of teaching. Before courses in education are made a requirement, they say, the educationists should first demonstrate their own ability as outstanding teachers. They should demonstrate what courses in education have done for them. "Theoretically the best teaching in a university should be found in its school of education."¹

If undergraduates in American universities and colleges would everywhere point to their courses in departments and schools of education as good examples of what the instruction in other departments ought to be, there would be no difficulty in bringing academic minds to a new orientation. But that is not what usually happens. On the contrary there are many institutions in which the students are inclined to single out the courses in education as examples of what good instruction ought not to be. Their testimony is often to the effect that what they get in the professional courses given by the department of education consists mainly of platitudes about teaching, classified first under the head of "Methods," then repeated as "Principles of Education," and

¹ George H. Betts, Professor of Education at Northwestern University, in *School and Society*, Vol. xxv, p. 494 ff. (1927).

finally glorified into a course entitled "The Philosophy of Teaching." Among the "great teachers" unearthed by Dr. Robert L. Kelly in his survey (already referred to) only seventeen were teachers of education, while 68 were in the field of English, 57 in mathematics, 44 in philosophy, 36 in history, 36 in the social sciences (economics, political science, and sociology), and so on. Only two fields produced fewer great teachers than education; namely, German and psychology. This may be due, in part at least, to the fact that education is a relatively new subject in college curricula, nevertheless it is not unnatural that men in the academic departments should keep asking the question: Why don't the educationists show us by example, as well as by precept, the way to teach effectively?

Various answers are given by the educationists to this question. One of them is that professors in departments and schools of education are concerned, and ought to be concerned, with the investigation of educational problems rather than with the demonstration of teaching methods. No one demands that every teacher in a law school shall prove himself a good practitioner, yet law schools manage to turn out many who become such. We do not require that teachers of English composition shall be writers of high distinction, yet they often succeed in producing young authors who are. And so it is argued that even if a professor of education makes no conspicuous success in his own classroom, his students may nevertheless be gaining a mastery of the subject from him. Good historians have sometimes been poor teachers of history. Good educationists may similarly, at times, be poor teachers of education. There are flaws in this line of reasoning by analogy, perhaps, but it is the defence that educationists occasionally put forward.

Between the foregoing extreme educationist and academic points of view there is a body of moderate opinion which includes representatives from both constituencies. There are educationists who believe that a thorough mastery of the subject matter is the all-important qualification of a college teacher and that it would be inadvisable at the present time to impose a definite requirement of professional courses in education upon candidates for the Ph.D. degree. They merely ask that elective opportunities be provided for those graduate students who would like to take such courses in education as part of their study programs for the doctorate. More particularly they advise that such elective opportunities should include the possibility of attending a course on the American educational system or a course on the problems of the American college. They argue that the relation of the college to the rest of the educational structure is such that college teachers ought to be reasonably familiar with all aspects of the latter. They point out, moreover, that not a few of those who become college teachers

will inevitably be diverted into administrative work as deans or presidents, and hence ought not to be denied an opportunity to equip themselves with what is believed to be an appropriate preparation for such work.

With this attitude there is a considerable amount of sympathy in the academic circle, especially among those who have come into contact with their more conservative colleagues in the field of education and have found in them a somewhat unexpected degree of sweet reasonableness. In a large number of instances men in the academic departments who are seeking to improve their work as teachers have been brought into relation with professors of education and have been benefited by the relationship. Much of the traditional suspicion which teachers in the subject-matter departments have harbored toward the work of the educationists is due to a feeling that the latter have been too aggressive in the matter of getting their courses "required" by state laws and regulations. There is a deep and widespread conviction among the rank and file of college teachers that the statutory preference now given to courses in education is excessive and unwise. Whether the schools and departments of education are chiefly responsible for the existing requirements in the matter of teachers' credentials is a matter of dispute, but at any rate they are usually given the major portion of the responsibility by critics of the present situation. Despite this resentment, however, and notwithstanding the persistence of a feeling that it is justified, there is a growing conviction in academic circles that much can be accomplished in the promotion of better teaching by cooperation between the two groups and that some means of securing this union of effort ought to be devised.

To reconcile the differences of opinion which have been alluded to in the foregoing paragraphs, or even at present to suggest a reasonable compromise among them, is by no means a simple task. It is quite obvious, however, that the best interests of college and university teaching would be served by some reconciliation of these divergent views. Some approach to a harmonious understanding should therefore be earnestly sought. Improvements in the training of teachers and in the technique of teaching can surely be better promoted by cooperation than by discord among educationist and academic groups, all of whom are striving in good faith to achieve the same end. Nothing much can be gained by continued estrangement while a great deal might be accomplished by the bringing together of these groups into a relation of mutual respect and tolerance.

On the other hand there is little prospect that any group of college professors, other than professors of education, would be willing to recommend, under present conditions, that all those who are preparing

to become college teachers should be required to take formal courses of a "professional" character. Apart from other considerations this attitude results from the belief that departments of education are not yet equipped to give courses at the graduate level with a content sufficiently well developed to make them of real value. It seems enough to suggest, at the present juncture, that universities and colleges be urged to direct an adequate amount of effort toward the improvement of undergraduate instruction by adjourning interdepartmental animosities. In their earnest desire for higher standards of teaching efficiency all departments of instruction, educationist or academic, should be willing to meet one another in a spirit of cordiality and to welcome help from whatever source derived.

The problem, moreover, is not merely one of prescribed courses in education. It is much broader than that. What the profession of college teaching requires at the present juncture, far more urgently than any prescription of courses in the technique of teaching, is the earnest pursuit of studies and investigations which will enable its members to become more effective in educational leadership, more adept and more objective in the evaluation of their own teaching, and more familiar with the processes of learning on the part of their own students.

One important desideratum, therefore, is the acquainting of every college teacher with the latest developments in the field of higher education presented in relation to the entire history of educational theory and practice in America as well as in the chief European countries. Whether this acquaintance is developed by taking courses or by reading authoritative books does not much matter. The vital thing is that college teachers, to a larger extent than at present, shall be induced to become familiar with the wider aspects of their own profession. Good books in this field, however, are by no means numerous. The young instructor who desires to familiarize himself with the most significant developments in higher education throughout the world during the past thirty years would hardly know where to turn today. Good books on this subject are more urgently needed than good courses.¹

Again, it is desirable that universities and colleges shall devote more attention to the gathering of materials which relate to the methods and results of instruction in individual departments. There has been very little systematic analysis of those records (*e. g.*, grades, examinations, failures, the choice of elective courses, the achievements of those undergraduates who go into graduate work, etc.) all of which might throw some light upon the quality of college teaching. College teachers are for the most part a law unto themselves. They have less supervision than is given to men in almost any other profession. Hardly

¹ A short list is suggested in the Appendix as an initial guide to those who may be interested in making some study of this field for themselves. See pp. 120-122.

anywhere else are men employed to do what they please in any way they please. This rare liberty often leads to an attitude of nonchalant indifference with respect to the relation between procedure and results. Relatively few college teachers stop to ask themselves what they are trying to accomplish, and still fewer proceed to find out whether they are accomplishing it.

It has been suggested that academic departments which are so earnestly concerned with research as a professorial activity might profitably bestow part of their solicitude upon research into the efficacy of their own teaching. They should see that records are so devised and kept that they can be analyzed, to the end that a spectrum of the light which radiates from their classroom exertions may occasionally be taken and studied. If even a small portion of the ingenuity and persistence which are now being expended on research of the usual type in American colleges and universities could be deflected, by the same men, toward research into the results of their own teaching, the improvement in the general standards of collegiate instruction might be considerable.

Meanwhile it is worth mention that some departments in a few of the larger universities have established courses in the methods of teaching their own subjects, and graduate students who intend to become college teachers are advised to take these courses in "Methods of Teaching History" or "Methods of Teaching Physics," as the case may be. Graduate instruction of this kind, given by men in the subject-matter departments, either alone or in cooperation with their colleagues from the department of education, is much to be encouraged: but such courses ought to be based upon data gathered in a reliable and systematic way. They should rest upon the results of research by academic teachers, even as the substantive courses within the department are so based. They should present methods which have been tried out, and the results of which have been sifted by the process of careful experimentation.

Finally, it is desirable that encouragement be given to all studies which aim to throw any light on the processes of learning by college students. Strangely enough, we know relatively little about the obstacles which the average student encounters in his attempts to learn. Inability to learn is a far more prevalent phenomenon in the American college than is inability to teach. Whether the inability to learn arises from mental indolence or mental incapacity the colleges do not usually know, nor have they been at any special pains to find out. It is easier to drop a student for low grades than to find out why he got them. So much attention, moreover, has been bestowed upon working out a better technique for college teachers that too little has been expended

on the task of trying to ascertain how students can spend their study-hours to better purpose.

There are some who will doubt whether it is worth a college professor's time to concern himself with matters such as those suggested in the preceding paragraphs. Perhaps it is not worth while—for some teachers at any rate. But the question will insistently arise whether those who function as active teachers of the academic subjects are ready to participate in the discussion of how these subjects can best be taught and learned, or whether they are minded to remain unconcerned when decisions so closely related to their work as teachers are made by administrative officers, educational researchers, educational reformers, accrediting associations, state legislatures, boards of regents, alumni committees, or departments and schools of education? For it is inevitable that such matters will be inquired into, discussed, surveyed, studied, recommended upon, written about, and ordered around by somebody. If professors in general take no interest in them, this does not mean that the ground will be left unploughed. Others less qualified will run their crooked furrows up and down the field.

Although this is hardly the place to elaborate a program for the stimulation of professorial interest in the general problem of improved college teaching, there is one definite step which will doubtless command general endorsement at the present time, namely, that when the personnel of a department or division is large enough, and where students are being prepared to become college teachers, there ought to be within its ranks at least one member who is especially interested in the problem of teaching. It should be his function to take the lead in promoting the discussion of teaching methods by his colleagues; he should be the counsellor of those students who expect to enter the profession of teaching, and in that connection should make himself familiar with their teaching experience and capacity. When young instructors are being recommended for teaching positions at other institutions he should be the chief source of reliable information concerning their teaching experience, capacity, and promise. Such a member of the department might also be expected to have charge of any self-study undertaken by a department or group of departments into the effectiveness of the teaching which is being carried on.

Attention should also be called to the recommendation made by the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers that every graduate school should "offer to students intending to engage in college teaching an adequate and varied course on the American college."¹ Such a course or seminar might well be accepted as part of the quantitative requirements in any department which is willing to give it such

¹ Association of American Colleges, *Bulletin*, vol. xv, pp. 41-42 (March, 1929).

rating. It should not be conducted entirely by teachers from the department or school of education but cooperatively by them and by selected members of the faculty of arts and sciences who have had large and varied experience in dealing with general college problems as heads of departments, chairmen of committees, or as teachers in several institutions.

The purpose of such a seminar should not be to explain how a college ought to be conducted but rather to discuss what its major problems are, how these are being dealt with, what experiments in methods of higher education are being carried on, and where reliable data relating to them can be obtained. It should seek to stimulate the habit of reading in this general field. To the end that such instruction may be made both timely and vital it is desirable, as President Wilkins has pointed out, that some central office should take the responsibility of obtaining a copy of the results obtained from every significant inquiry at any college so far as this relates to a problem of general interest.¹

Arrangements should likewise be made whereby lists of such documents would periodically be made available to instructors in all seminars of this character and copies of any desired document furnished on payment of the actual cost involved. It would seem appropriate that the Association should undertake the systematic maintenance of a clearing-house service through the medium of its monthly *Bulletin*. Already this is being done to some extent.

9. THE TEACHER'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY

College professors have need of the committee's reminder that their vocation imposes upon them a threefold duty. As teachers of youth they are expected to impart knowledge efficiently and thereby to inspire their students into "self-propelled intellectual activity." It is their obligation to leave nothing undone in performing this part of their duty to the institutions which they serve.

But they are also charged with the obligation of engaging in research or some other form of creative and scholarly activity. Research is not an end in itself. It is rather a natural product of intellectual vitality and it is this vitality that a college teacher ought to demonstrate in some creative way. He may, of course, do this in other ways than in research of the usual type. Teaching, on the other hand, is not the whole of a college professor's job, although some educationists seem tacitly to assume that it is. To say that a man has proved himself a good teacher, even an excellent teacher, does not mean that he has fulfilled the whole of his professorial responsibility.

¹ "The Teacher as Colleague" in the *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. iii, p. 517 (December, 1932).

Finally, the college professor has the duty of taking his proper share of leadership in the direction of educational policy. He and his colleagues determine by their interest and wisdom whether the atmosphere of the college shall be of the kind that facilitates good teaching and creative effort on the part of the faculty. For it is the college faculty that decides what shall be taught, and how, and to whom, and by what methods. It is the faculty that fixes the requirements for admission to college, the scope and nature of the curriculum, the standards of undergraduate scholarship, and the requirements for graduation. It is not the board of trustees nor the administrative officers but the college teachers who decide all these things, and in determining them they give trend or direction to the whole course of higher education.

Not only this, but college teachers, in fixing the educational policies of their own institutions, exert a far-reaching influence upon both the secondary and the professional schools. They occupy a pivotal point in the whole system of American education and this imposes upon their profession a high responsibility to which its members have not always risen. Too many members of college faculties look upon educational issues with unconcern even within their own institutions, and regard their obligations as having been fulfilled when they do their daily stint of teaching and study.

Meanwhile every educational critic takes his fling at the college, asserting that it should clarify its objectives, or adjust itself to the new era, or socialize its curriculum, or integrate its courses, or adopt new-type examinations, or abolish examinations altogether, or give every undergraduate a tutor who would sit by the fire with him and smoke, or make all its professors attend summer schools of education, or do away with all requirements for admission except graduation from any high school, or hire a faculty of "golden personalities."

Laymen sometimes wonder, and with good reason, why college professors so often let this bombardment of futilities play upon them and their institutions without a gesture of defence. The reason is that too many of them know little and care less about what is being said by the critics of higher education, or about what is going on in other institutions, or even in other departments of their own institutions. One way of changing this situation would be for college administrators to encourage the unfettered discussion of educational policies, problems, methods, and criticisms at meetings of their faculties. Discussions of this nature are not more frequently initiated by college professors because of a feeling, in some institutions, that the administrative authorities do not desire the full and frank expression of professorial opinion which would be the outcome. It is sometimes said that opinions can be expressed by professors at chapter meetings of the Association which

would be resented if given expression at faculty meetings in the same institution.

Such conditions of restraint, however, are happily uncommon. In most universities and colleges the meetings of the faculty provide a forum of discussion that is relatively free and untrammelled. The general tendency, however, is to utilize faculty meetings for routine business rather than for the discussion of broad and fundamental questions of educational procedure. How often, for example, are college faculties encouraged to devote some of their meetings to the discussion of such topics as are listed in the Appendix to this *Report*,¹ all of which deserve careful consideration by college teachers as well as by college administrators? Chapters of the Association might also be helpful in this respect if they would devote each year a series of meetings to the discussion of timely and nation-wide issues connected with college organization, policy, methods, and problems. Such discussions would be of especial value to the younger members of the teaching staff.

There was a time, in most of the larger institutions, when faculty meetings were regularly devoted to the spirited discussions of live educational problems, and this is still true in many of the smaller colleges as well as in some of the larger ones. President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard displayed masterful skill in getting his faculty to debate fundamental questions of academic policy week after week for hours at a stretch. He built a body of teachers and researchers into a corps of educators. But more and more it is becoming the general practice to have all the larger questions of institutional policy discussed and determined by administrative boards, educational councils, committees of deans, or by some other relatively small body in which only the heads of departments or older faculty members participate.

Faculties, when they meet nowadays in some of the larger universities, and in a few of the smaller ones as well, merely adopt reports of a cut-and-dried nature, do some routine business, listen to various announcements, and are told that a motion to adjourn will be in order. There are institutions in which faculty sessions do not occupy more than four or five hours in an entire academic year. Sometimes the members of the faculty in such colleges do not hear of the creation of new schools or departments, the planning of additional buildings, the abolition of certain courses, or even the reduction of professors' salaries until after the decisions have been reached by some executive authority.

This practice is often defended on the ground that faculties have become so big and unwieldy that they are no longer able to reach decisions without long drawn out debates which involve inordinate delays. The new procedure means, however, that important questions of general

¹ See pp. 104-105.

academic interest are taken up and settled by groups of men who are no longer young and with whom the existing traditions naturally count for much. It means, also, that young instructors and assistant professors, at a time when their minds are still in a receptive stage, do not find themselves brought closely into contact with the general problems of higher education at all. Having no such contact, they get out of the way of thinking about them.

Faculty meetings ought to provide, in effect, an all the year round continuation course in college problems. They should be used to stimulate thought and reflection upon these issues by every teacher, young or old. It is at faculty meetings that teachers should have opportunity to learn what is going on in other departments than their own and at other institutions than their own. It is there that they should be encouraged to think as educators, not as professors of individual subjects. The way to get college professors interested in the broader phases of educational planning is to invest them with the responsibilities of decision. The way to bring out the professors to a faculty meeting is to bring out the issues.

This point of view has been admirably presented by President Wilkins in a recent article from which the following paragraphs deserve quotation here.

"The primary duty of the college teacher is unquestionably to teach in his chosen field as well as he can. But to say that it is his primary duty is not to say that it is his only duty: academic life is not so simple as that. His teaching is not done in a local world consisting exclusively of his classroom, his departmental office, and the library: it is done in a local world which includes many departmental interests besides his own and many activities and experiences other than teaching and learning. Hence he may be sure that his teaching will be enriched by better knowledge of allied or even distant curricular fields and by entering into the interests of his colleagues; and that an alert participation in the general college enterprise will make his teaching more effective by giving him a clear perception of his functions, a sure understanding of the real dispositions and needs of the contemporary student body, and a better adjustment to the conditions and the opportunities of the whole collegiate environment and of the surrounding social environment.

"Similarly one gains in breadth and in efficiency if one enters with hearty readiness into the broad and largely different range of problems which confront the college as a whole. Some of these are particular problems of current administration or interpretation which arise under adopted policies—problems relating to the improvement of instruction; the giving of curricular advice; the giving of other personal advice; the approval or disapproval of proposed new courses; the maintenance of

honors work; attendance; grading or ranking system; supplementary instruction, such as assembly talks, recitals, and the like; special opportunities for exceptionally able students; living conditions of students; fraternities and sororities; extra-curricular activities; student aids; discipline; admission; alumni relations; appointments; and budget.

"Other problems are themselves problems of policy—or problems of innovation or of reorganization. The college ought frequently to define its aims in the light of its relation to a constantly changing society. Who shall face and answer these problems? The administration alone? Not for a moment. The task is so large, so difficult, so vital, that it demands the hearty participation of the entire faculty. Every teacher should be ready to bear his part of this varied and heavy common burden, which is also a rich common opportunity."¹

10. ASSISTING THE TEACHER IN SERVICE

Assuming that a promising young teacher has been selected and has been appointed to a place on the teaching staff of a college, what are the most effective means of assisting him to be successful in his work? It is said that poor teaching is occasionally due to a failure on the part of the teacher to realize what is expected of him.² Sometimes he fails to grasp the purpose of the instruction that he is trying to impart and is ready to foist upon his undergraduate classes the methods and standards that have come with him from his postgraduate seminars. Some institutions have therefore found it advantageous to give new instructors a certain amount of orientation in the aims and routine of the place, pointing out the things to do and the things to avoid. This is done by providing them with a carefully framed set of mimeographed suggestions or, better still, by arranging for them an informal conference with older members of the faculty who are known to be wise counsellors.

Young instructors who come from the graduate schools of large universities often arouse the resentment of their undergraduate students at the very outset by departing radically from the established local traditions or routine—for example, by assigning twice the usual quota of laboratory problems, or requiring them to purchase an undue number of new books, or by using some new and more rigid marking system than the students have been accustomed to. Not infrequently, as a result of such misjudgment, a new instructor gets his class irritated at the start, then loses confidence in himself and takes most of the year to regain it. Mishaps of this nature are less likely to occur when young instructors are given specific information and friendly advice at the

¹ *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. iii, p. 496 (December, 1932).

² See the article on "The In-Service Training of Young College Teachers," by A. M. Palmer, in *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, vol. xv, pp. 443-467 (December, 1929).

very beginning of their work. Deans and heads of departments should therefore take pains to make it easy for new instructors to obtain the guidance of older teachers. The latter, in turn, should be careful not to do or say anything that would tend to restrain the young teacher's initiative or keep him from trying to do things in his own way. Within reasonable bounds he should be encouraged to experiment with his own methods of teaching and should be shown how this can be done with the best prospects of success.

Somewhat elaborate experiments in the way of formal and organized visitation to the classes of younger teachers have been tried at many institutions, but only in rare instances have they been successful. Such visitations to college classrooms when made by deans or other administrative officers are almost always misconstrued and usually do more harm than good. They should be avoided.

College administrators sometimes complain about this aversion to inspectorial visitations. "They wish good teaching rewarded" says one of them, "and yet the members of my faculty deny me the most effective way for uncovering good teaching." It is natural, however, that young instructors should feel much embarrassed when they find the president, dean, or some other administrative superior striding unannounced into the classroom, where he views the proceedings with a critical eye and a notebook in hand. On such occasions any young instructor, however self-possessed, is likely to become confused and to do his worst. Moreover such formal visitations tend to give students the impression that their instructor is not enjoying the full confidence of the higher authorities and this tends to weaken their confidence in him.

On the other hand the practice of informal visitation by older colleagues in the same department, particularly when made at the invitation of the instructor, usually proves helpful. The success or failure of such a plan depends, however, on the motives which inspire the visit. If the purpose is merely to determine whether an instructor ought to be retained, promoted, or dismissed, the results are likely to be disturbing and unsatisfactory; but if the informal visitation is inspired by a desire to provide the instructor with friendly and constructive suggestions as a help to the easing of his difficulties, the practice will usually bring beneficial results all around. It has proved to be especially helpful in the case of candidates for the doctorate who are giving part-time service as assistants or teaching fellows.

The Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, already referred to, recommended that the process of advising new instructors should be centered mainly on the making and reviewing of periodic reports by the young teacher. Such reports should set forth the results achieved during the period under review and should indicate

the problems that have been encountered as well as the instructor's ways of meeting them. The reports would then be carefully read by some senior colleague who would confer with the instructor concerning his difficulties and if necessary visit his classroom in order to give more intelligent counsel. There is a danger, however, that this making and scrutinizing of regular reports would tend to formalize the whole procedure, and the essence of helpfulness in this matter is its informality.

There is another type of visitation which seems to be more valuable than the one mentioned. It consists of frequent visits made by the younger men to classes in the same department or in other departments taught by older teachers who are known to be successful. This practice has not been used to any large extent but wherever it is tried the advantages of the plan are highly commended, especially by the young teachers concerned. In some of the larger universities it has become the habit of graduate students to visit several undergraduate classes, noting the methods used by teachers of established reputation. Some misgivings have been expressed lest this type of visitation, if conducted on an extensive scale, may lead to a slavish imitation of established instructional methods and may deter neophyte teachers from striking out along new paths of their own.

Some college administrators have a feeling that professors are likely to resent the invasion of their classrooms and laboratories for any inquisitorial purpose whatsoever, but it has usually been found that their opposition disappears whenever the faculty becomes convinced that the visiting has helpful ends in view and when the presence of outsiders in the classroom becomes so common as to pass unnoticed by the students. For example, at the University of Chicago, where experiments with a new University College Plan are being carried forward, the members of the examining staff have felt a need to become acquainted with the work which is being done in the classrooms. Consequently the doors of all College classes are thrown wide open to visitors, some of whom are likely to be found there at each meeting of the course. Thus the examiners are able to come and go without embarrassing the instructor or distracting the attention of the students.

Whenever practicable, moreover, it is regarded as desirable that in courses for which a newly appointed instructor is mainly responsible a few of the lectures or recitations should be taken by one of his older colleagues. This will give the latter some idea of the morale which has been established in the course and of the progress which it is making. New instructors should also be invited to give occasional lectures or hold recitations in courses other than their own. If the young instructor is forceful and inspiring, this enables him to extend his reputa-

tion over a wider circle. In the large elementary courses at some institutions it is the practice to give each young instructor an occasional opportunity to appear before the class as a whole.

Some of the larger colleges have established regular conferences for instructors in courses which conduct numerous sections, but such conferences seem to be devoted for the most part to the discussion of textbooks, reading assignments, examination questions, coordination of marks, the reporting of poor students, and such details. Very seldom is any attention given to the general problems of teaching. A notable exception was found in the case of the Department of Mathematics at the University of Delaware. At this institution meetings of the entire staff of the department are held weekly, and on alternate weeks the meeting is devoted exclusively to problems and methods of instruction. At the Case School of Applied Science a regular seminar has been established "to stimulate study and experimentation with a view to more effective teaching." It is primarily designed for "men in the middle and lower ranks of the faculty whose primary tastes do not lie in the field of specialized research." Weekly sessions are held throughout the academic year, each session lasting about an hour and a half. A syllabus of topics and a reading list is made up for each semester. The seminar is intended to provide a channel "through which advances in educational technique may become more promptly and widely known in the several departments, to stimulate the experimental use of new methods of teaching and testing, and to evolve criteria by which the effectiveness of teaching may be appraised more accurately."

It would seem desirable that seminars of this nature should be provided whenever practicable, especially in the smaller institutions. Or, as an alternative, there might be occasional staff conferences of the teachers in allied departments for an exchange of ideas and suggestions. Part of every teacher's time belongs to the advancement of his profession, that is, to the renewal of its sources of fertility. Good departmental functioning is not merely a matter of close attention to schedules, grades, announcements, promotions, equipment, and other routine or details. The broader aspects of instructional efficiency should have at least an occasional self-survey and discussion.

Many institutions maintain standing faculty committees on administration and some have similar committees on instruction. The latter usually concern themselves, however, with the arrangement and articulation of courses rather than with the methods by which the courses are given. At a few institutions provision has been made for standing faculty committees on the improvement of teaching. They are said to be serving a useful purpose. Special committees for promoting an improvement in the quality of undergraduate instruction have also

been set to work at intervals in many universities and colleges. Their value depends on the personnel of the committee and more particularly upon the efficiency of the chairman. It is difficult for such committees to accomplish much without treading upon somebody's toes and in college faculties there is a sort of senatorial courtesy which impels the members of one department to refrain from seeming to interfere in the affairs of another.

The University of Minnesota has had for more than ten years an All-University Committee on Educational Research and under its direction many excellent studies of teaching problems have been made. The function of the committee is to study the problems and to publish its findings. Such changes as the findings suggest are left to other agencies for execution. Much of the work has been done through sub-committees made up of one or two instructors in education together with from three to ten members of other departments. The individual studies made by the All-University Committee, or under its direction, relate to such topics as the efficiency of instruction in classes of different sizes, an analysis of the marking systems in vogue at the University, the value of laboratory instruction in physics, methods of teaching the social sciences, the reading problems of college students, prerequisite courses, the characteristics of superior college teachers, freshmen failures in mathematics, and so on. The University of Minnesota appears to have gone farther than any other American institution of higher education in the self-study of its teaching problems. It has been approaching these problems by way of research rather than by way of didactics.¹

In discussing the available facilities for improving the work of the in-service teacher, mention should be made of the possibilities offered by the various summer schools. College teachers have not been very numerous as patrons of these summer sessions, although excellent instruction of an advanced grade is offered at some of them. The summer sessions for engineering teachers, sponsored by the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education, form a rather notable exception as respects the attendance of college teachers. The general purpose of these sessions is to improve the teaching of engineering (including such subjects of the engineering curriculum as English, Economics, Physics, and Mathematics). The sessions are held each year at different institutions throughout the country, each session being devoted to a study of the methods of teaching a particular subject or group of subjects. They have been notably successful.

¹ A sketch of the Committee's work may be found in the article on "The Improvement of College Instruction through Educational Research," by Melvin E. Haggerty which is published in the *Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions* (University of Chicago Press, 1930), vol. ii, pp. 190-216.

11. SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF GOOD TEACHING

Assuming that an institution has devised satisfactory methods for differentiating between the good and the not-so-good members of its instructional staff, how can adequate recognition of the former be assured? Various suggestions with reference to possible ways of doing this have been discussed at chapter meetings of the Association. One of these suggestions is that colleges ought not to have salary schedules which provide uniform salaries for all teachers of the same rank but should be free to single out their best teachers and give them special stipends well above the normal rate. Taking the situation throughout the country as it now stands, the highest stipends usually go to those professors who have served the longest, irrespective of their relative competence as teachers. It is true that those who make their mark as research scholars are frequently promoted in advance of their time, but as respects the members of a college faculty who are not engaged in any form of creative activity or administrative work the usual rule is promotion by seniority. It occasionally happens, to be sure, that a teacher who is known to be uncommonly successful receives the recognition of an earlier advance; but for the most part the good teacher has to wait his turn. The rule of seniority is the line of least embarrassment to all concerned; but it sometimes results in making the institution pay for more, or for less, than it receives.

It is especially hard on the most capable of the younger men in college faculties. Without stimulus, encouragement, or recognition the best of these younger teachers sometimes become dispirited and lose their enthusiasm. They find it a long climb to the top. There are now a few poor teachers in college faculties who once were good teachers, or at any rate had the making of good teachers. There will be fewer of them when college executives bestir themselves as diligently to discover and reward instructional excellence as they have worked to increase enrolments, secure new buildings, expand the curriculum, and keep their best research men from going elsewhere.

On the other hand it is well to recognize that there are potential dangers in any move to place good teaching on a high pedestal. This is because it involves certain subtle interactions between teacher and student which are extremely difficult to discern and to follow. The most distinguishing earmark of the good teacher's work is not to be found in the immediate or momentary interest of his students but in the long-range, pervasive effects upon their intellectual outlook and habits of thought. Unless this is kept prominently in mind there is a danger that the endeavor to single out and reward good teaching may merely result in subsidizing the showy, plausible, spellbinding, good-

mixer type of instructor, of whom a few examples are to be found in almost any college faculty. Such men occasionally get a favorable undergraduate reputation without deserving it. Their intrinsic value to the college is not great. Excellence in teaching ought to be rewarded, but not until the colleges have devised satisfactory criteria whereby genuine excellence can be clearly differentiated from campus popularity.

Good teachers are frequently drawn off into administrative work. At some institutions there appears to be a feeling that one way to gain early advancement in rank and salary is by becoming a member of the administrative staff, as a dean, assistant dean, director of extension, or whatever the post may be. College professors sometimes confess that their acceptance of an administrative position was motivated, in part at least, by the expectation of a step upward in academic grade or compensation. The general standards of teaching have probably been affected, in some measure, by the fact that not a few of the best instructors in institutions throughout the country are year by year persuaded to accept administrative posts and to give up their teaching and research in whole or in part.

It may be that such an outflow from the classroom and laboratories into the administrative offices is inevitable because the very qualities which make a man a successful teacher tend to assure his success in administrative work. The man who is clear in his thinking, orderly in his methods, keenly interested in his students, and endowed with an agreeable personality is the one to whom the head of the institution naturally turns when an administrative post of high responsibility is to be filled. Likewise it is eminently proper that deans and other administrative officers should be rewarded with rank and compensation in keeping with the importance of the duties which they perform. But college professors, as a class, quite naturally feel that the recognition of good teaching should come so promptly and be of such a substantial nature that no one who does his teaching well, and enjoys it, need let himself be drawn away from this high calling by the higher prestige and pay of an administrative position.

A few institutions have established a special salary provision for superior teaching. Wesleyan University, Connecticut, for example, has a considerable sum available each year for this purpose. The awards (\$2500 per year above the normal salary to six men, and \$1250 to eight men) are tentatively planned to be made for "superiority in teaching, influence on undergraduates, eminence as scholars, intellectual growth, and service to the college and the community." The first awards (for three years) were voted by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees on the basis of a questionnaire sent to all members

of the faculty and to all graduates of not more than ten years' standing. Two-thirds of the faculty and six hundred and fifty graduates returned the questionnaire with their answers. The experiment at this institution, however, has not yet reached a stage at which either the faculty or the trustees are ready to pass final judgment upon it.

The University of Chicago recently adopted the practice of citing each year a certain number of faculty members "in recognition of their excellence in the teaching of undergraduates," these citations being accompanied by increases in salary. Comments from faculty members are to the effect that these special awards of honor, with the accompanying increases in salary, provide "a stimulus more effective than anything else that has ever been said or done in the University of Chicago for the development of excellence in collegiate instruction."

There is reason to believe that a good deal can be accomplished for stimulation of better teaching in this way. But one may seriously doubt the wisdom of basing the allocation upon the answers to a questionnaire addressed to the faculty in general, or to alumni, or to students. Better ways of doing it, with justice to all concerned, can be found. And when increases in salary are made as the reward of superior teaching they should be in the form of a permanent advance rather than in the form of a subsidy to be paid during the pleasure of an administrative officer or for a short term of years. Any plan whereby such increases take the form of a temporary bonus, terminable at pleasure or in a few years, might encourage the subservience of the beneficiaries to those who make the determination. It might result in restricting, by a roundabout method, the full measure of academic freedom which college teachers regard as essential to the integrity of their profession and which they are anxious to preserve at any cost. Misgivings on this score may seem to be far-fetched, but there is no point on which college professors are more sensitive than on the proposition that they must have liberty to teach without fear or favor what they believe to be the truth.

Apart from the specific rewards which may be accorded to superior teachers by the institutions themselves, there is also the question whether a better measure of recognition may not be secured for them at the hands of learned societies and professional organizations. Under present conditions these associations are largely dominated by research men. Their officers are selected, in the main, from this category. Their meetings are mainly devoted to the discussion of matters closely connected with research and publication. To all this there are, of course, a few exceptions. A partial remedy may be found in the practice of organizing sections of learned and professional societies or even new associations which devote themselves to the discussion of teaching problems and the membership of which is made up of those who are

interested in teaching rather than in research or in college administration.

A good example is found in the Mathematical Association of America, which is organized and maintained in part for the discussion of teaching problems as distinguished from the research activities which are characteristics of the older American Mathematical Society. In some other fields of the curriculum a similar division has been made. Such segregation on a basis of primary interest is worth encouragement. It enables those whose main interest is in the teaching of a subject to join in the discussion of common problems and to gain from the outcome of one another's experiences. Universities and colleges often pay the expenses of those professors who attend meetings of learned and professional societies for the purpose of presenting the results of their researches. It would be appropriate to do similarly for those who desire to attend conventions and conferences in order to learn more about the technique of teaching in their respective subjects. The professional journals should likewise be encouraged to give more attention to the instructional aspects of academic life.

12. THE TEACHER'S SECURITY OF TENURE

Members of the governing boards, in universities and colleges, sometimes ask why professors should insist upon greater security of tenure than is accorded to men in other professions. Offhand they do not see why the tenure of a professorship should be looked upon as a life job while the occupancy of nearly every other professional position is subject to termination at any time. There is a feeling among college administrators to some extent, and occasionally among professors themselves, that this traditional security of academic tenure tends to lower the general standards of teaching in institutions of higher education. Men who feel secure in their positions are alleged to become unprogressive, indifferent, and sometimes indolent as well. We would have better teaching, it is sometimes said, if college professors had to justify their continuance in their posts as other men do.

It is undoubtedly true that security of tenure has its defects as well as its merits.¹ But the college professor does not urge it as a measure of personal advantage. The American Association of University Professors, in upholding it as essential to the best interests of higher education in America, is not thinking mainly of the benefits which its own members gain from security of tenure. As well might one say that

¹ "If an officer on permanent appointment abuses his privilege as a professor, the University must suffer and it is proper that it should suffer. This is only the direct and inevitable consequence of the lack of foresight and wisdom involved in the original appointment. Freedom of expression must be given the members of a university faculty, even though it be abused; for the abuse of it is not so great an evil as the restriction of such liberty."—President Harper, of the University of Chicago, quoted in *The University Faculty*, by Floyd W. Reeves and others (University of Chicago Press, 1933), p. 71.

the Supreme Court of the United States, in guarding the tenure of the federal judiciary, is moved by solicitude for the personal interests of the individual justices. On the contrary it is concerned with a much larger issue. If governments were permitted to dismiss judges at will there would soon be an end to judicial freedom, independence, and impartiality. We know this because some governments have tried the plan.

The college teacher looks upon his own profession from a somewhat similar point of view. He knows that complete freedom to teach the truth as he sees it, and full liberty to publish the results of his researches as he finds them, are dependent upon a feeling that his tenure is secure. Freedom and security go together. One cannot exist without the other. The college teacher needs security to bring out the best that is in him, to divert his thoughts from compensation to the opportunities of his position, to give him that peace of mind without which good work is impossible and, above all, to make practicable a full measure of intellectual integrity.¹ The teacher who holds his place at the pleasure of someone in authority is not a free agent. The right to terminate a college professor's tenure at will might eliminate from college faculties some men who do not give the worth of their wages, but its effect upon those who are several times worthy would be disturbing in the extreme. The loss would far more than offset the gain.

In order to exert a high degree of beneficial influence upon his students, the college teacher must first induce their confidence in his sincerity. He must convince them that he is intellectually free and concerned with nothing but the eternal verities. If, therefore, the students in any college classroom reach the conclusion that their teacher is afraid to speak his whole mind or give his conscientious beliefs, the day of his influence over them is done. Hence college presidents and governing boards ought to realize that nothing would more surely impair the whole morale of college instruction than a feeling among the students that those who lead them are themselves being led, in other words that their instructors are free to say what they think only so long as it coincides with the opinions of those in authority.

13. NON-TEACHING ACTIVITIES IN THEIR EFFECT UPON TEACHING

In some quarters there is an impression that the quality of instruction is occasionally affected to its detriment by the amount of time which college teachers often give to committee work, extension lectures, or correspondence work, as well as various other activities which go under the name of community service.

Diligent inquiry was made in the course of this survey to ascertain

¹ See the Presidential Address of Professor E. R. A. Seligman, printed in the *Bulletin*, vol. viii, p. 99 (February, 1922).

whether such an impression is general among members of college faculties. No appreciable complaint was found to exist with respect to an overload of committee work. Service on faculty committees does not seem to constitute a serious interference with the quality of teaching except in rare instances. The burden of committee service in most colleges is well distributed and where this is done the work has a beneficial influence upon the teachers who share in it. Committee work brings members of different departments together, makes them better acquainted and promotes a spirit of tolerance with respect to each other's views.

It is generally conceded, moreover, that members of the teaching staff ought to be kept in reasonably close touch with the administrative work of the university or college, and service on committees is one way of accomplishing this result. There is some tendency to professionalize administrative work in universities and colleges by having it done on a full-time basis by men who are not teachers and who know little about the teacher's problems. A further drift in the direction can hardly be avoided if teachers manifest an aversion to their share of the administrative duties. Occasionally, however, individual members of a college faculty find themselves overloaded by being appointed to an undue number of committees in which case other obligations may suffer.

University extension work has greatly increased its proportions throughout the country during the past twenty years. In some institutions certain members of the faculty do a great deal of it, particularly in those departments which make a strong appeal to current public interest. Present programs of extension work do not seem to interfere with the standards of intramural teaching save in exceptional cases; but it is felt that extension lecturing has sometimes proved detrimental to research work and the other scholarly pursuits of those engaged in it. In its larger aspects the value of extension work to the community is undeniable. On the other hand it may well be questioned whether some of the teachers who engage in this form of instruction would not be rendering a greater service to themselves and to their own students if their free energies could be concentrated on the advancement of knowledge instead of being diverted into the field of adult education.

Not a few members of college faculties are engaged in unremunerated work which is closely connected with their own domains of scholarship, such as editing a scientific publication, or holding office in a learned society, or acting in an advisory capacity to some branch of the public service. Such duties occasionally take a considerable portion of a teacher's unscheduled time, but rarely is any allowance made for it by the college authorities when his teaching-load is being determined. It appears to be the feeling among members of the Association that

college teachers should be encouraged to do unremunerated work of the kind indicated because its reaction upon their classroom proficiency is likely to be beneficial. It tends to keep them in touch with the outside world and abreast of what is going on. The encouragement of such work should take the form of some allowance in the teacher's regular schedule if the circumstances warrant it. Many institutions are already making such concessions.

On the other hand it is well to point out that professors and their colleges should be on guard against undue impositions in the way of unremunerated service. Members of college faculties are almost daily importuned to do all manner of things under the general caption of service to the public. Organizations of every sort seem to feel that institutions of higher education exist for the purpose of providing them with free speakers at meetings, conferences, service club luncheons, and other gatherings. There are many college professors who, if they accepted all the invitations of this character that come to them, would have no time for teaching or anything else.

Left to the professors themselves the situation would be easy enough to handle by prompt and unequivocal declinations, but in many cases pressure is put upon them by the administrative heads of institutions to comply with these requests as a means of keeping the college in touch with its constituency. And inasmuch as some members of the teaching staff have no facility in outside speech making, the whole burden comes upon those who do. Such men, very often, happen to be the best classroom teachers and occasionally the most competent research men as well. Outside engagements cut into their work in one or both capacities.

College administrators ought to remember that every hour diverted to what is compendiously known as "community service" takes time and energy from the professor's main job of teaching and study. For only a superhuman teacher can serve on committees, do extension work, give public lectures, be at the beck and call of the community, keep up his researches, and still maintain high standards of classroom instruction. Absorption in research is not always the chief offender in putting pressure on the teacher's time. Non-teaching activities of an assorted character are often entitled to a larger share of the blame.

Then there is the matter of remunerated outside employment such as serving as industrial consultant, or doing editorial work for newspapers or magazines, or acting as the paid secretary of some civic organization. Remunerated work of this kind takes a great variety of forms, and if it usurps too much of a teacher's time may constitute a serious distraction from what ought to be his main concern. In a few institutions this problem has reached proportions of such gravity that

general regulations concerning it have had to be laid down by governing boards. In most colleges and universities, however, the amount of time diverted by teachers to outside remunerated employment is not relatively large, and the general academic opinion is that whenever intervention is needed it may best be by individual action rather than by general rule. In deciding whether action is needed in any individual case it is obvious that much should depend upon the closeness with which the outside employment approaches the teacher's field of scholarly interest.

Evening classes are now being held at many institutions, particularly in large urban communities, and in some cases they have led to an over working of the teaching staff. This evening work, when superimposed upon a full schedule of daytime teaching, is altogether likely to result not only in a lowering of the teacher's classroom proficiency but to prove a great obstacle in the way of his productive work as well. Hence it is generally felt that such evening classes, as well as extension courses, correspondence courses, and even committee work within the institution, if it be of any considerable amount, should be reckoned as part of the weekly teaching load and should be paid for within the teacher's regular salary rather than as extra compensation.

14. THE PROPER DETERMINATION OF THE TEACHING-LOAD

It is customary, in most colleges, to expect that each member of the faculty shall have a teaching schedule which is usually stated as so many clock-hours per week. Frequent exceptions are made in the case of those teachers who have a considerable amount of administrative work to do and in some cases a reduced schedule is arranged for professors who are engaged upon important projects of research. In general the standard schedule varies from eight to sixteen teaching hours per week. It is usually lighter in the larger institutions than in the smaller ones.

Any close approach to uniformity in the teaching-load, without reference to the size of an instructor's classes, or the nature of his subject (*e. g.*, whether it is one involving much supervision of laboratory work), or the amount of preparation needed, is likely to work injustice. Hence it is desirable that schedules shall be a matter of flexible adjustment, but of definite understanding, between each individual instructor and the head of his department or the dean or the president, as the case may be. It is only in this way that proper allowance can be made for the considerable differences in what the institution expects its various instructors to do. Such an arrangement places a good deal of responsibility upon those who determine the individual schedules and

may cause them some embarrassment at times, but it ought to be assumed and discharged in the general interest.

The teachers who most commonly find themselves overloaded are the young instructors. It is taken for granted that having little or no committee work to do they can easily carry the maximum quota of teaching hours. Too often there is an overlooking of the fact that young teachers usually find it necessary to spend a great deal of time in preparation for their classes and may also have a formidable number of weekly papers to read. Heavy schedules, in such cases, often lead to inadequate preparation and poor teaching. These two usually go together, in fact it is probable that more poor teaching is due to deficient preparation than to any other cause. One of the important matters to be investigated, in any departmental self-study of teaching efficiency, is the relation of classroom schedules to the other academic obligations of each instructor.

15. DIVIDING LARGE CLASSES INTO SMALL SECTIONS

One reason for the unduly burdensome load of teaching that is sometimes imposed upon members of the faculty is the tendency to divide all large classes into small sections. Everywhere there seems to be a firm conviction that the small-section plan facilitates more effective teaching. Opinions as to the superiority of the small section over the large class, and of the discussion method over the lecture system, seem to be firmly and widely held, irrespective of the subject which is being taught or the maturity of the students concerned. College administrators have been brought to a realization of the fact that the cost of this instruction in small sections is very high, but most of them believe that the increased expenditure is fully justified by the results. Hence it is not uncommon to find a large elementary course divided into ten or even fifteen sections of twenty or thirty students each.

This almost universal opinion concerning the superiority of the small section, however, does not appear to rest upon any basis of results actually tested and proved. Investigations have been made at several institutions for the purpose of ascertaining whether the instruction given by the same teacher in small classes is more efficient than that given by him in larger ones. Attention may be directed, for example, to the experiments conducted by Professors J. B. Edmonson and S. J. Mulder at the University of Michigan¹ and to those reported by Professor Earl Hudelson at the University of Minnesota.² Seventy-three separate experiments were tried by the latter, involving nearly

¹ The results were published in the *Journal of Educational Research*, vol. ix, pp. 1-12 (January 1, 1924).

² See the article "Are Classes Too Large," by Professor Hudelson in the *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. i, pp. 436-439; also his monograph on *Class Size at the College Level* (University of Minnesota Press, 1928).

ten thousand students under thirty-five teachers in nineteen different college courses in thirteen departments of six colleges.

The procedure was to "organize two small sections in the same course, composed of an equal number of students of the same sex, the same level of intelligence, and the same past scholarship records; and then to add to the enrolment of one section until it became from two to seven times the size of the small class." Both were then given the same tests and examinations. The smallest experimental section had only eight students while the largest class had nearly four hundred. Strange to say, in four experiments out of every five, the large classes did better than the small sections, although the cost of instruction in the small sections was from three to eight times that of the large classes.

No careful study of the subject, so far as is known, has thus far demonstrated that the splitting up of large classes into small sections is worth any considerable part of the large expenditure which the practice entails. It is quite possible, of course, that this failure to prove the superiority of the small-section method is due to imperfections in the mechanism which has been set up for measuring the results. It is sometimes argued, for example, that the tests used in these experiments have been of the kind which measure nothing more than the capacity to assimilate and retain knowledge—that they do not gauge a student's intellectual grasp and power. It is probably true, of course, that information can be assimilated and retained by a student just as easily in a class of four hundred as in a section of ten. Hence there is no profit in lecturing to a small group rather than to a large one. Likewise a laboratory demonstration can be just as vividly presented to a whole amphitheatre of students as to a small handful grouped around the instructor's table. Accordingly there is no gain in reducing the size of the class if the instructor pursues the same methods of instruction in both cases. The real question is whether the small section permits a new and better method of instruction.

It would seem inevitable that it must do so in some cases—in the elementary foreign language courses, for example. Likewise with slow or backward students the small group obviously permits a degree of individual attention which is not practicable when these students are thrown with others into large classes. A few institutions have established the practice of putting the lowest group of students into "remedial sections" and have found the results beneficial. Moreover, it may well be that the small-section method has certain values of an intangible character which cannot be measured by any sort of test, whether new type or old. The intimate association of a capable teacher with a small group of students may bring advantages which are impossible to evaluate by any formal process, but which may

be of great and enduring importance nevertheless. The extent of a teacher's lasting influence upon his students is not always to be discovered by examining them at the end of the year. Often they do not themselves discover and appreciate it until long after they have graduated.

One serious defect of the small-section method, however, is the fact that it necessarily keeps a large part of the student body from being exposed to the influence of great teachers and of men who have made their mark as productive scholars. At best no college can hope to possess more than a few Gamaliels, and such men cannot possibly come into contact with large numbers of undergraduates if their teaching has to be done in small sections. The result is that only a few students obtain what ought to be a privilege of many—the chance to come under the spell of a few immortals. Great teachers do not spend their lives teaching small classes. And the common practice of loading a promising young teacher with the drudgery of several sections a day, making him go over the same ground repeatedly, will eliminate the likelihood of his ever becoming a great teacher, if anything will.

It would be hazardous at this stage to pronounce any opinion on the general issue. Among any group of college professors one can readily precipitate a controversy as to whether the Edmonson-Mulder-Hudelson experiments are conclusive in proving what they are asserted to have proved. It is worth while to reiterate, however, and to lay stress upon the fact that the widespread belief in the superiority of the small-class plan does not seem to have been established by any demonstration of superiority in results.

The same is true of the general aversion to the lecture method. The literature of higher education is full of vigorous assaults upon college lecturing. It has been pilloried as dull, insipid, unstimulating, and a relic of scholasticism. It may, indeed, deserve all this invective, but it is none the less worthy of remark that the ineffectiveness of the lecture system for use in all subjects and under all circumstances has not yet been established by any scientific investigation of its merits and shortcomings as contrasted with those of other instructional methods.

This whole matter is one of the most vital importance to college professors. The abolition of lectures has cut down the size of classes, and hence has brought about a heavy increase in the cost of instruction. Spread through the whole curriculum it has trebled or quadrupled the outlay. Is it wise for colleges to shoulder this heavy burden of additional expense for the sake of certain intangible, long-range, suppositious values which are believed to exist but can not be measured or demonstrated? College professors, on most questions of educational method

involving heavy expense, demand to be shown. It might be well for them to make such a demand in this case, for the professors as a class are paying the cost. Much of the income from college endowments and from tuition fees which otherwise would have been available for raising the scale of salaries during the past twenty years has gone into the reduction of classes in size.

The matter ought to be given further study before the present policy of small-group instruction becomes crystallized through the planning of classroom buildings. In many institutions these buildings are now being erected with a minimum of large lecture halls and a maximum of small seminar rooms, each accommodating twenty to forty students. A study of the question, conducted on a comprehensive scale, might show that the plan of dividing large classes into small sections has marked advantages in the teaching of some subjects but none at all in the teaching of others. It might indicate that the advantages are less in elementary than in advanced courses although under present practice the former are often the larger. It might demonstrate that the lecture method can be profitably used in some subjects or parts of subjects, either alone or in combination with some other method of instruction. Or it might corroborate the findings of various educationists to the effect that the small-section plan seems to have no demonstrable net advantages anywhere.

A comprehensive investigation of this matter is of particular urgency at the present time because universities and colleges have undergone a large shrinkage in their annual income. They are finding it essential to cut down their budgets by reducing the teaching staff, increasing the weekly teaching-load and cutting salaries. Perhaps the economy could be better effected by doubling up the sections. Not improbably this policy of increasing the size of classes will be attempted anyhow, and in a hit-or-miss way, in other words at points where the largest savings can be made irrespective of the harm that may be done to the quality of the instruction. An increase in the size of classes, if it is inevitable for the sake of economy, ought to be made at points where it has been ascertained to be least detrimental. And this is something that college faculties should make it their business to find out.

One of the most useful investigations that any faculty committee could make at the present juncture, therefore, is a careful study as to the ways in which the size of college classes can be increased without detriment, or with the least detriment, to the interests of instruction, whether in elementary or in advanced work, whether in some departments but not in others, and whether some compromise through the substitution of lectures for the small-section recitations without

replacing the latter entirely, or the substitution, in part, of demonstrations for laboratory work, can be worked out under the stress of present conditions.

16. SECTIONING ON THE BASIS OF ABILITY OR ACHIEVEMENT

Ten years ago a committee of the Association presented the results of a somewhat elaborate investigation of this subject, which was supplemented by an additional report three years later.¹ Various advantages of the segregation plan were there set forth. Since the publication of these reports a considerable amount of experimenting has been carried on with reference to the most advantageous way of organizing sections in large courses and the consensus of opinion among college professors now seems to be that a certain amount of segregation on the basis of ability is desirable in the sections of large elementary courses.

There is a feeling, however, that the process can easily be carried too far. In some instances an attempt has been made to organize sections at four or five levels of student capacity. This complicates the mechanism and does not seem to give any substantial advantages which can not be obtained by dividing the students into two groups. In the case of freshmen courses a difficulty arises as to the basis upon which the assignments to the different sections can best be made. Some institutions make them on a basis of secondary school records, while others utilize special "placement" tests. It is essential to the successful working of the graded section plan that students shall be moved from one section to another in accordance with their demonstrated capacity to do the work, but the relative inflexibility of classroom schedules in many institutions does not always permit this to be done. The field is one in which much further experimentation must be carried on before final conclusions are warranted.

17. COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS AND EXTERNAL EXAMINERS AS AIDS TO GOOD TEACHING

The methods of examination used in colleges and universities have been considerably improved in recent years. More particularly the use of what are known as "comprehensive" examinations has been widely extended. The term comprehensive examination, however, seems to include almost any form of examination that is more inclusive than a regular course examination. Such examinations, therefore, disclose varying degrees of comprehensiveness. Sometimes they cover the work of a single course plus a designated amount of outside reading; more often their range extends over two or more courses. Occasionally,

¹ *Bulletin*, vol. ix, pp 275-290 (October, 1923) and vol. xii, pp. 133-191 (February-March, 1926).

as at Harvard, the comprehensive examination covers the whole of a student's major field, or field of concentration. Under such an arrangement the comprehensive examination, or series of such examinations, may embrace the work done in five or six courses together with outside reading as well.

The purpose of the comprehensive examination is twofold. It aims to induce an integration of the student's work in a particular field. Its object is also to ascertain the student's intellectual grasp and power rather than to find out how much information he has been able to acquire. An additional aim of the comprehensive examination is to stimulate the student to do outside reading, so that he will master a subject rather than a course or group of courses. In other words, such examinations aim to repair the damage which has been done by dividing the academic curriculum into many small compartments—into courses, half courses, and quarter courses, each of which often covers only a very small portion of the subject and does not articulate with the others. Comprehensive examinations form an essential part of an honors program, or a tutorial plan, or indeed of any scheme which provides for independent reading on the part of the student.

Professors in institutions which have made use of comprehensive examinations seem to be, on the whole, well satisfied with them. Such examinations, especially when preceded by tutoring or frequent conferences, make possible a smaller amount of classroom instruction. They encourage the student to read independently and to correlate his knowledge. They give him a feeling that he is studying a subject and not merely trying to get credit for a course. Finally, they stimulate the members of the faculty to coordinate the work done by them in courses within each department or division. Occasionally one encounters the criticism that comprehensive examinations tend to restrict the freedom of the individual professor by making him feel that he must prepare his students to pass these examinations whether or not he approves the sort of questions which are asked. They transform him from a teacher to a coach, these critics complain. But when the examinations are properly framed and intelligently administered this objection does not usually arise.

An exhaustive study of these examinations has been made during the past two years.¹ Significant conclusions were reached as a result of this study which hardly need to be repeated here.² Perhaps the one most worthy of emphasis is this: that "the kind of college is an important variable in considering a comprehensive examining system." Of itself the establishment of a comprehensive examination system

¹ Edward S. Jones, *Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. 436).

² Pp. 240-245.

does not amount to much unless both the faculty and the students take it seriously. In some institutions it appears to be little more than a gesture.

Experience has shown that when properly planned and administered the comprehensive examination helps to integrate a student's work and encourages him to keep the notes of his several courses until the end. When, moreover, it is accompanied by some plan of special instruction and when marked changes are made in the curriculum; likewise when it is distinctly understood that the comprehensive examination does not merely cover the work involved in the regular courses but is actually comprehensive of a field; finally when it carries considerable weight among the requirements for a degree, and preferably when some outside examining influences are present—under such conditions its effect on the improvement of teaching soon becomes apparent. Many professors in colleges which use the comprehensive examination report that such examinations have encouraged them to unify their courses and to think more of topics which spread into other departments, besides assisting them to hold their superior students to levels of thought and expression higher than they ever reached before.

It would seem inevitable that if comprehensive examinations become universal the result will be a reduction of the number of hours per week spent by the students at regular classroom exercises. The slack will be taken up by an increase in the time spent by professors and instructors with their students at individual conferences and in small seminars. Something in the way of such conferences or seminars must be provided if the comprehensive examination at the end of the sophomore or senior year is to be a vital factor in the educational process. To notify the undergraduate that he must take a comprehensive examination and then let him get his preparation for it without guidance or aid of any sort—such an arrangement merely results in making the examination a formality which keeps no one from getting his degree. Undergraduate students will not, of their own volition, undertake special preparation for an examination which is a year or two away. They will leave it till the last week or two.

Hence it is that comprehensive examinations have proved most successful at institutions where a well-organized tutorial system has been established to prepare students for them. Such tutorial assistance involves heavy expense, for good tutors are rare and costly. The outlay need not be prohibitive, however, even in colleges which have moderate resources, if it is borne in mind that tutoring ought to be a substitute for courses rather than a supplement to them.

In some cases external examiners are used in connection with these examinations. The external examiner has long been a participant in

British and Continental systems of examinations, but American colleges have been slow to adopt the same practice. At Swarthmore College, however, external examiners from other colleges take an active part in all examinations for honors. About a dozen such examiners are now brought in for this work every year. The experience at Swarthmore is that the system works satisfactorily when certain difficulties due to the unfamiliarity of the external examiners have been overcome.

Although this utilization of professors from other institutions commends itself as an excellent practice whenever feasible, it is well to point out that the essential thing is to have examiners who are external to the group of students that is being examined. It is not essential that such examiners shall be external to the institution in which they are serving as examiners. For instance, it is usually practicable and desirable to have examinations for honors conducted by a committee, some members of which have not been giving classroom instruction in the specific fields which the examination covers. At some institutions all comprehensive examinations are prepared by such committees or by all the members of a department serving as an examining board. In such cases the general effect is much the same as though the examinations were conducted by external examiners; in some respects it is even better.

As a rule it is found that the relationship between the instructor and his class undergoes a favorable change when external examiners or an examining committee like the university board of examiners at the University of Chicago conducts the test, because the students then realize that their instructor is not alone in determining their fate, but is merely helping them to pass an ordeal which is administered to them by others.¹ To that extent the plan contributes substantially to the potential improvement of teaching.

18. NEW TYPE TESTS AS A MEANS OF IMPROVING COLLEGE TEACHING

Examinations such as are customarily given in college courses have frequently been criticized by students because they are alleged to require answers the evaluation of which depends upon the crotchets or idiosyncrasies of the individual instructor. The problem of passing a course, according to undergraduate opinion, is often merely one of handing back to the instructor in concentrated form what he has spread before the class during the year. Color is lent to this suspicion by the fact that two instructors in the same department sometimes give

¹ Those who are interested in the art of examination as practiced by institutions of higher education in different countries may be referred to the summary of the proceedings at the Eastbourne (England) Conference, by Professor Charles H. Judd, which is printed in the *Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions*, vol. iii, pp. 179-189 (University of Chicago Press, 1931). Mention should also be made of the recent Bulletin of the University of Minnesota on *Differential Functions of Examinations*, vol. xxi, No. 4 (January 25, 1933).

different grades to the same answers at weekly tests or at final examinations. Obviously, when students are asked to express their own opinions on any problem, or to give reasons for their opinions, there will be variations in the value assigned to these opinions and reasons as estimated by different examiners. One unfortunate result of this is that undergraduate students often look upon the conventional type of examination as a test of one's ability to satisfy an individual instructor rather than as a real measurement of intellectual capacity or achievement.

To meet this criticism an endeavor has been made to devise new-type examinations of an entirely objective character. These tests, as thus far worked out, call for answers which are either right or wrong, leaving the examiner no discretion. For example, they usually contain lists of statements which the student is asked to designate as either true or false. Or they utilize various other ways of securing answers which can be definitely marked as correct or incorrect.

These new type tests have thus far been used for the most part in departments of education only. There the results are favorably and sometimes enthusiastically regarded. But academic departments in some institutions have found them advantageous for use in elementary courses—for example, at Columbia University, and in the Departments of Botany and Zoology at the Ohio State University, as well as in the Department of Romance Languages at the University of Chicago and at the State University of Iowa. Where the purpose of a course is to provide students with a definite body of knowledge as a basis for more advanced work in the same subject the new type tests would seem to have considerable usefulness.

Criticism is frequently directed against any general use of these tests, however, on the ground that they "merely measure the acquisition by the student of the concrete elements which make up the content of his courses," whereas the main function of the teacher is to stimulate critical thinking, to train his students in methods of reasoning and to carry them back to the sources of the facts, as well as to encourage them to form their own conclusions. These desirable attainments of the individual in his studentship can not be adequately measured, it is said, by any kind of examination which merely requires him to recall and report concrete facts. What the good teacher usually wants to know is not merely whether his students have obtained a sufficient body of information from him and from their reading but whether they can use this information as the basis on which to do some clear thinking for themselves.

Critics of the new type examinations lay a good deal of stress on this contention that the tests shed little or no light upon the vital question whether a student has learned to make profitable use of what

he has gained by taking a college course. In other words the tests are asserted to be tests of acquisition and memory rather than of power and performance. This view, of course, is not shared by some advocates of the new examinations who contend that there is a definite correlation between knowing facts and being able to use them.

It is also asserted that objective tests can be devised to measure reasoning as well as retention.¹ The American Council on Education is now engaged in working out a series of tests which, it is hoped, will possess this quality and which will eventually be available in all subjects of the college curriculum. Many college professors, however, will continue to doubt the likelihood of success in this enterprise although they would welcome any device which will secure for them, in a strictly objective way, what they are now seeking to find out by the use of the conventional type of examination.

Meanwhile there are those who feel that advantage can be had by combining the new type questions with those of the traditional variety, using both as parts of the same examination. Many instructors believe that they have obtained good results by using such a combination. But the entire substitution of the new for the old type of examination is not believed by the majority of college teachers to be a desirable step in any subject or at any stage in it. At the University of Buffalo in 1931 a survey indicated that two-thirds of the faculty had no confidence in the new type tests, mainly because the examples which they had seen in their own fields were so crude and unsatisfactory.² The same proportion appears to hold among college faculties throughout the country. Those who share this point of view seem inclined to believe that the problem type or essay type of examination, which has been generally used in colleges, can be greatly improved by concentrating adequate attention upon it, and that it can be made sufficiently objective by the use of external examiners. Discussions of this subject have everywhere brought forward the suggestion that in striving to improve teaching it is of the highest importance to focus thought upon improvements in the art of examination.

19. ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING

Various administrative contrivances have been established to improve the efficiency of undergraduate instruction by vesting the chief responsibility for it in some college official or faculty board. Some of these seem to be working well. A few institutions maintain regular faculty committees on the improvement of teaching. Experience has shown,

¹ See the article by Professor Karl J. Holzinger on "The Development of Tests at the College Level" in the *Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers*, vol. iii, pp. 216-227 (University of Chicago Press, 1931).

² E. S. Jones, *Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges*, p. 212 (footnote).

however, that the personnel of such committees has to be chosen with great circumspection if their work is to prove successful. The task of persuading college teachers to change their ways is one that has to be performed with great patience and tact. Members of one college department do not relish being told how to teach by men from other departments. Above all, perhaps, they dislike being told how to do it by a committee made up mainly of professors from the departments of education and psychology. This intra-faculty touchiness is regrettable, but little is ever gained by disregarding it. The estrangement between certain faculty groups ought to be mollified in the endeavor to reach a common end. The first step, on the part of both educationist and academic groups, would seem to be an honest recognition of their own limitations.

From what source has most of the initiative come with respect to improved methods of teaching in the colleges during the past twenty years? By far the larger part of it appears to have been provided by college faculties and faculty committees. Educationists have done most of the writing about such matters but the larger part of the propulsive force has not been supplied by them. New plans of admission to college, honors courses, preceptorial and tutorial systems, independent study courses, group majors, comprehensive examinations, external examiners—these and many other innovations have come for the most part from studies made by committees of academic faculties. The reports of these committees are seldom published and do not have any circulation beyond the bounds of the institution concerned, but those which have been collected by the Field Director in the course of the present survey seem to be of much greater interest and value than are many of the reports which have been put out during the same period by educationist organizations and researchers.

The suggestion has been made that every college ought to have a Director of Teaching, or at least some one whose duty it would be to look after this important branch of collegiate interest, just as the Director of Athletics has been given special obligations in another field of campus activity. But the idea does not meet with favor among college teachers, most of whom seem to feel that the head of each department is the one who ought to take the responsibility for the betterment of teaching methods within his own domain. A more popular suggestion is that those professors who are primarily interested in teaching might be permitted and encouraged to use sabbatical absences in improving their proficiency by making a study of teaching at other institutions. Too often, under present conditions, they are pressed to utilize this free time in research work.

20. EXPERIMENTS WITH NEW METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

The methods of instruction used in American colleges and universities have been undergoing a steady transformation and improvement during the past thirty years.¹ More particularly these changes have been designed to make the student a more active participant in the process of education and to provide the best students with a stimulus which they do not always receive in the regular courses. Among these new methods a few of the most important may be singled out for a word of comment; namely, honors courses, independent study courses, group majors, tutorial systems, discussion conferences, and free periods for reading.

(a) *Honors Courses*

Various plans for the awarding of general honors or special honors have been established at many institutions—well over a hundred of them—but sometimes they mean nothing more than that a good student can be relieved from his routine work and assigned to follow some independent program of study with or without supervision when he so desires. In other words he may or may not be provided with a tutor or with the opportunity to have informal conferences on his special program at varying intervals with one or more of his instructors. Honors courses have been rather glowingly set forth in college catalogues, but in the course of the present survey the Field Director found that at some institutions in which honors courses are reported to flourish, many members of the faculty were hardly aware of their existence. Professor Edward S. Jones, in his comprehensive survey, found that only a fourth or a fifth of the able students in colleges were taking these courses when given the opportunity.

The arrangements with respect to candidacy for honors, and honors courses, disclose the widest variety at those institutions which are experimenting with them. They range all the way from "general honors," or the mere recognition of high grades in regular courses, to elaborate "special honors" programs covering two or three years of study, with comprehensive examinations and a thesis at the end.

The usual argument in favor of honors courses is that they provide what the regular curriculum does not afford; namely, the opportunity for the superior student to do special work along the lines of his special aptitude. Moreover they encourage him to work up to his full capacity and not merely to keep up with the class. In a sense they are a protest against the cult of democracy in education, or the lock-step system of

¹ An excellent survey of the changes which have been made in the American educational system during the past generation may be found in the chapter which Professor Charles H. Judd contributed to the *Report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends* (2 Vols., New York, 1933), vol. i, pp. 325-381.

teaching which has required the professor to spend so much of his time holding below-average or reluctant students to a respectable level of classroom performance.

On the other hand it is sometimes objected that honors courses lead to an undue specialization at a too-early stage. "They are too narrowing and tie the student down to one or two professors." While well adapted to the needs of a student who is going forward with post-graduate study in a special field, a system which encourages him to concentrate so much of his attention on a single subject is not regarded by everyone as altogether appropriate for those undergraduates who ought to be laying a broader foundation. It is sometimes objected, moreover, that the pursuing of an honors course in one department causes the student to neglect his obligation to required courses in other departments. Finally, there is a widespread feeling that the practice of asking instructors to supervise the work of candidates for honors, without giving them any relief from their regular schedules of classroom teaching, is detrimental to the effectiveness of the whole instructional program.

Honors courses entail either a considerable appropriation for additional teachers or a good deal of extra work on the part of the faculty. Too often the latter alternative has been chosen by college administrators and by faculties with resulting overloads that offset most of the benefit derived. Both college administrators and college faculties ought to realize that proper attention to the supervision of candidates for honors is a time-consuming task which can not be satisfactorily performed unless the college is willing to pay the cost.

Whether these honors systems have contributed much, if anything, to the general improvement of teaching is a matter on which opinions vary. And well they may, for the colleges have gathered no convincing data on this point. Most of them merely assume that the plan is succeeding because there has been an increase in the number of honors candidates. In some cases where this evidence has been taken as conclusive it appears that the questions on the honors examination are little more than duplications of those used in the regular course examinations or, if not duplications, are of much the same type. This is almost certain to be the case unless external examiners are used.

(b) *Independent Study Courses*

Somewhat akin to the honors courses are the so-called "reading courses" or "independent study courses." Under this arrangement every student majoring in a department is required to take at least one course which is chiefly made up of independent reading. Conferences on this reading are held at intervals; in some departments they are con-

ducted in seminar fashion, in others, because of the large number of students involved, they approach the ordinary classroom procedure. What has been said with reference to the supervision of honors courses applies equally here. An independent study course in which the student receives a minimum of guidance or direction from his instructors is not likely to be of great value to him. On the other hand if adequate general supervision of his work is provided it consumes a great deal of the instructors' time, and unless this is reckoned in the regular teaching-load or entrusted to special tutors it tends to overburden the teaching staff. If college administrators and faculties would realize that reading courses, properly conducted, require just as much of the faculty's time as do any other kind of courses they would not be so ready to expand the curriculum in this way without envisioning a proportionate increase in the teaching personnel.

(c) *Group Majors*

Excessive departmentalization of the student's major program of study is being made the basis of some complaint. This is a problem of curricular organization rather than of teaching. Departments too frequently hold students to narrow intra-departmental programs when the latter elect to do their major work therein, and do not permit them to take appropriate courses in allied fields. This is sometimes the result of a desire to keep up departmental enrolments. Some institutions have endeavored to provide a remedy for this complaint by establishing "group majors;" *i. e.*, courses of major study drawn from more than one department. To this end the departments are organized into divisions or groups, such as languages and literature, mathematical sciences, natural sciences, and social studies. Any student who presents a properly coordinated plan of major study within the group of departments is then allowed to follow it.

(d) *Teaching by Tutors or Preceptors*

During the past twenty-five years there has been a strong drift in the direction of individualized instruction. This began at Princeton with the appointment of preceptors to give supplementary instruction in the individual courses, but Harvard presently developed the idea in a new direction. The Harvard tutors do not function in a course but in a subject or group of subjects. They give their full time, or most of their time, to individualized conferences with sophomores, juniors, and seniors. During the past twenty years Harvard has built up a large corps of capable tutors who are not assigned to individual courses, or even to departments, but whose function is to help the students prepare for their final comprehensive examinations within a designated "divi-

sion" or group of departments. A tutor may have the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or even professor, and he is compensated accordingly.

Some Harvard tutors give a certain amount of classroom instruction, while others give none at all. Twenty to thirty students, drawn from the three upper undergraduate classes, are assigned to each tutor. He meets them one by one at intervals (the seniors more frequently than juniors or sophomores) for half-hour conferences. The system is regarded as extremely successful by most of the students and most of the faculty, but it is an expensive enterprise and not many institutions could afford it on the plane at which Harvard maintains it. A somewhat different plan at Swarthmore College is also worth the attention of any institution which thinks of venturing upon a tutorial plan.

Some major difficulties have arisen in connection with tutors and tutoring. One is that it takes several years to train a good tutor, by which time he sometimes prefers to give up this type of instruction and officiate in regular courses on his own account. At Harvard it has been the understanding that a member of the staff engaged in tutorial work shall have the same rank and salary as a member of the staff engaged in giving regular courses, and this understanding has been, for the most part, carried into practice. At the outset it was predicted that most capable young scholars would rather teach than tutor (using the terms in the ordinary sense) and that they would leave one job for the other whenever they got the opportunity; but in the main this prediction does not appear to have been fulfilled. There are many who remain tutors by preference. Experience has shown, however, that really successful tutors are rare. They are rarer and more expensive than instructors of the usual type. The demands on a tutor's personality, patience, and versatility, as well as upon his scholarship, are not easy to satisfy. It takes infinite watchfulness, as well as a heavy expenditure, to secure and keep the right men.

But while the tutorial system is expensive, it is not necessarily beyond the financial resources of most American colleges if they are willing to put an end to the continued expansion of departments and formal courses—in other words, if they will devote to tutorial work the new resources which would ordinarily go to the enlargement of the curriculum and the appointment of additional teachers. One of the advantageous by-products of the tutorial system is that it can serve as an automatic check upon the undue multiplication of these formal courses.

(e) *Discussion Conferences*

Some institutions prefer "discussion conferences" to individual tutoring. The argument is that the presence of other students in the room

makes the interview with the instructor more stimulating. It is also contended that under the conference plan the student is brought into contact with several instructors rather than with a single tutor. The conference arrangement, finally, is much less expensive. But unless those who conduct the conferences are teachers of superior ability, such meetings inevitably degenerate into recitations of the usual type.

(f) *Free Periods for Reading*

A few institutions have experimented with free periods for student reading. This arrangement represents an attempt to transplant a traditional English practice to American soil. At Oxford and Cambridge, as is well known, the undergraduate does much of his studying during periods in which no formal instruction is given and no tutoring done. The use of the free reading period in American colleges has sometimes meant the discontinuance of classroom work in individual courses for short intervals. When such periods are not synchronized in all departments the students usually divert their free time in one course to others which have not been discontinued. At Harvard the free reading period involves the shutting down of all regular courses (except those for freshmen), and the discontinuance of all tutorial work during an interval of about three weeks immediately before the mid-year and final examinations. During this period the student attends no classes or conferences of any kind but is supposed to give all his time to private study. It might be thought that such an arrangement would result in a general exodus of undergraduates from the campus, but although the plan has been tried for several years this fear has not been realized. On the contrary there is every reason to believe that most of the undergraduates do their best work during these free reading periods.

In discussing the results of the various experiments one is impressed by the wide and seemingly irreconcilable differences of opinion which can be found among teachers at the institutions themselves. Why cannot it be clearly established whether a given experiment is successful or not? The reason is that most of the experiments have not been conducted under conditions which enable this to be done. The conditions have not been controlled. Hence the degree of success, or lack of it, is largely a matter of individual opinion. It is desirable that the experimental process be continued, but in a way that will ensure the objective demonstration of results.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION

Better teaching is much to be desired in institutions of higher education but it would be futile to think that improvements in teaching, no matter how extensive, will of themselves provide a solution for all the problems, or even for the most important problems, which now confront the college and university faculties of the United States. Even more urgent, for example, than the need for higher standards of teaching is the need for higher standards of scholastic work on the part of the American undergraduate. Teaching can never be what it ought to be until a greater degree of intellectual response and cooperation is inspired in the student body.

The measure of scholastic achievement now required in undergraduate work, taking American universities and colleges as a whole, is altogether too low. It varies, moreover, from one department to another within the same institution, or from one course to another within the same department, to such an extent that those teachers who try to maintain high standards find themselves handicapped by the mediocrity of performance to which their students have elsewhere become habituated. One of the essential prerequisites of improved teaching, therefore, is the elimination of low-standard courses from college catalogues.

Meanwhile college faculties should beware of educational devices for the improvement of college teaching which are being extensively advertised as wonder-working contrivances for gaining the end without the means, the goal without the travail. There is no magic in any plan of instruction, taken by itself. Methods are like clocks: they go from the motion that men give them. It stands to reason that no pedagogical device will wrest high-grade results from a combination of low-grade students and low-grade instructors. There is no substitute for competence and sincerity in college teaching. No method of instruction will be effective if these are lacking. Put well-prepared and willing students into the same classrooms or laboratories with capable, sincere, inspiring, diligent teachers—and everything else will take care of itself. The way to get good teaching is to employ good teachers. Hence the primary problem is not one of methods but of men.

PART IV

APPENDIX

I. PRELIMINARY LIST OF QUESTIONS PREPARED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SUBMITTED FOR DISCUSSION TO THE CHAPTERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1. What are the effective means for assisting the teacher in service?
 - (a) A definite understanding of what is expected of him?
 - (b) Visits to classes of younger teachers by experienced members of the department?
 - (c) Visits by the younger men to classes in the same department, or in other departments, taught by successful teachers?
 - (d) Conferences among members of the staff?
2. How can the methods used in the selection and enlistment of teachers be improved?
3. How can recognition of good teaching be increased?
 - (a) Placing excellence in teaching on at least as high a footing as successful research as a basis for promotion in rank and salary?
 - (b) Making the rewards for good teaching such that one need not be induced to become an administrator to secure advancement?
 - (c) Special salary provisions for superior teaching?
4. Under what conditions, if any, can student and alumni criticism and rating of teachers be successfully employed?
 - (a) To improve teaching?
 - (b) To determine teaching success with a view to its reward by advancement in rank and salary?
5. What is the effect upon teaching of activities such as the following:
 - (a) Committee work within the institution? Extension and correspondence work?
 - (b) Unremunerated work closely related to the field of scholarship, such as editorial work?
 - (c) Remunerated outside employment, such as serving as industrial consultants?
 - (d) Evening classes and work at other institutions?
6. Is there evidence that courses in education contribute to the preparation of the college teacher?
 - (a) As a part of general college training?
 - (b) As a requirement for candidates for the doctor's degree?

7. How much emphasis should be placed on background and general culture in the training of college teachers?
8. How important is it that college teachers know something about the major problems of higher education? How can such knowledge be obtained?
 - (a) By teachers in service?
 - (b) During the period of preparation for teaching?
9. What has been the effect of the comprehensive examination on teaching? Of the external examiner?
10. Can new type tests be used to improve teaching?
 - (a) In the individual course?
 - (b) To determine the relative efficiency of teachers?
11. Is there a gain from meeting students in small sections and if so does it justify the cost? Are sectioning and placement on the basis of achievement worth while and practicable?
12. What values attach to such methods of instruction as the tutorial system, the conference plan, honors courses, group majors, free periods for reading, etc.?
13. What values attach to such administrative practices as the following:
 - (a) Standing faculty committee on the improvement of teaching?
 - (b) Inter-departmental conferences for discussion of college teaching?
 - (c) Committee on educational research to foster cooperation between the department, college, or school of education and other departments, colleges, and schools on the campus?
 - (d) Research projects in the field of college teaching carried on independently by faculty members or groups of faculty members?
 - (e) Appointment of some official whose special function is to promote effective teaching?
 - (f) Visiting and exchange professors appointed because of their success as teachers rather than as research workers?

II. REPLY OF THE WILLIAMS COLLEGE CHAPTER TO THE PRELIMINARY LIST OF QUESTIONS

1. (a) There is, in general, agreement that instructors should know more definitely than is sometimes the case just what the

department and the college expect of them. Such matters as scholastic standards, systems of grading, and the general aims of courses, both as separate units and as related to departmental and more general objectives, should be formulated as clearly as possible.

- (b) The great majority at Williams feel that visits to classes of younger teachers by experienced members of the department are not desirable for the following reasons: a young teacher may not be seen at his best and may not be judged fairly on the basis of such visits; a young teacher should be allowed to develop his technique without nagging or the exercise of a spy system; and students should not get the idea that their instructor is on probation. Individuals in two departments, only, approve of this practice.
 - (c) There is general agreement that it is helpful for the younger men to visit classes conducted by experienced and successful teachers. This is especially satisfactory in departments where the members alternate in conducting multi-sectioned courses.
 - (d) There is general agreement that conferences among members of the staff are extremely useful. The more informal the nature of such conferences is, the better for all concerned. The spirit of such conferences should be friendly and cooperative. Undue assumption of authority by seniors in a department is generally to be deprecated.
2. In the selection of new teachers, a close contact is desirable between the candidate and the department, which should assume the major responsibility in this important matter. The Williams faculty stress the value of a personal knowledge of the candidate, and are skeptical about relying upon references and recommendations in general. They feel that university recommendations regarding teaching ability are not reliable. It is suggested by many that all new teachers should be first appointed for a term of one year only.
3. (a) The great majority at Williams affirm that ability in college teaching should outweigh success in research as a basis for promotion in rank and salary. A relatively small number assert that good teaching implies activity in research, which should be expected and encouraged. Research is not necessarily to be measured by varying amounts of publication, and is to be defined liberally rather than gauged mechanically.
- (b) The consensus of opinion is, obviously, for a liberal reward for teaching ability.

- (c) The faculty agree that in theory a marked superiority in teaching should be recognized, but the great majority stress the practical difficulties involved in administering any "special salary provisions" and regard such a policy with skepticism. Some suggest that a flexible system of promotion is the best means of solving the problem.
- 4. (a) The carefully weighed opinion of a group of the best students, whether before or after graduation, is of value for the teacher in appraising and improving his work. Other student opinion is negligible.
(b) The opinion of the alumni in general or of the student body as a whole, being difficult to obtain and evaluate, is of very dubious value, and it would be highly undesirable to base promotion on such grounds.
- 5. (a) The faculty agree that a moderate amount of committee work is useful in the gaining of new ideas and personal contacts. Problems of extension and correspondence work are unreal for the majority of teachers at Williams.
(b) The faculty agree that no generalization is possible here. Editorial work might be helpful, or it might be a drag.
(c) This problem applies only to a small minority at Williams. A moderate amount of experience as industrial consultant may well aid in the applied side of science.
- 6. A few of the faculty express no opinion because of lack of personal experience. Another small group admit that courses in Education of the more recent type should make a teacher more conscious of his problems and more resourceful in solving them. The majority, however, are skeptical in admitting that there is any value in such courses for the college teacher.
- 7. The great difficulty in this topic derives from a general vagueness in the definition of the terms employed. The consensus of opinion, here, is that a great deal of emphasis should be placed on cultural background, granting a liberal interpretation of the word culture. Some state that culture is more important in "certain fields" than in others; others assert that a rich cultural background is necessary for the proper presentation of any course in a liberal college.
- 8. There is general agreement that the teacher must secure through reading and study as well as through his own teaching a broad view (not necessarily technical) of the whole field of higher education.

9. The faculty response to this question is limited, for lack of experience, to conjecture. Some feel that this type of examination would lead to a more stereotyped sort of instruction than we now have. A department of science sees a value in the external examiner as a means of keeping up with the latest developments in science.
10. (a) (b) According to the experience of the few members of this faculty who have employed the new type of examinations, these tests are of doubtful value. Those who have tried them are skeptical, although they admit that the new type of tests may be useful in testing factual content.
11. The faculty approve of the small section of about twenty students for the purposes of the class discussion. Concerning sectioning on the basis of ability there is a divergence of opinion. Honors sections appear to be more generally favored in the literary courses. This method is occasionally adopted, however, in the social sciences. The department of Physics reports that sections for the very good students are worth while, but that sections for D and E men are undesirable. The department of Chemistry does not approve of sectioning according to ability.
12. In general the majority of teachers at Williams favor the honors work in practice here for the benefit of approximately twenty-five per cent of the two upper classes, as offering intimate contacts between instructor and student and as affording opportunities for doing independent work involving initiative and originality, and for releasing certain qualified students from rigid curriculum requirements.

The tutorial system is not used here, and the Reading Period is offered in only one course for seniors, but the faculty is disposed on the whole to regard both these methods with favor. Some say that the necessary expense of so favoring the brilliant few is not justified in our democratic system.
13. (a) Some of the faculty believe that a faculty committee on the improvement of teaching would be valuable. More feel, however, that such a committee would have little merit.

(b) The majority favor inter-departmental conferences. Some believe that more use could be made of such conferences.

(c) (d) (e) These topics are more the concern of the universities.

- (f) A minority favor the idea of visiting and exchange professors. The majority consider this problem more connected with the university situation.

III. REPLY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS CHAPTER TO THE PRELIMINARY LIST OF QUESTIONS

1.
 - (a) The teacher should be thoroughly instructed concerning the duties expected of him. The best person to give such instruction is the professor in charge of the type of work which he is expected to do.
 - (b) In the University of Kansas visits are usually made by experienced members of the department to the classes of younger teachers in charge of sections of elementary classes. This seems a good practice.
 - (c) Visits by young men to classes in the same department or other departments taught by successful teachers should be encouraged.
 - (d) Conferences among members of the staff who are doing the same work are good, provided such conferences do not degenerate into dictation by the older members of methods to be followed by the younger men. In general all the methods suggested in Question 1 are thought of as applying especially to work of elementary character.
2. The choice of teachers in a department should be left to the department itself. There should also be a definite period of probation for new teachers, and it should be generally understood that any appointment is experimental in character.
3.
 - (a) Yes.
 - (b) Yes.
 - (c) Yes. It was thought by several members of the committee that faculty control of budget and promotions would go far toward rectifying any unfortunate situation which may exist with respect to lack of proper encouragement of good teaching in the University.
4. It was felt that information gained from students and alumni concerning the rating of teachers should be used only with the highest degree of caution, if at all. It is conceded that such methods may be helpful if used in moderation and not in any formal way. For example, the using of questionnaires should be discouraged. It is felt that the best judgment of a man's work is to be gained from his colleagues within and

without his own department, or, in case of less well known instructors, from the members of his own department.

5. (a) Committee work, to a reasonable amount, is good and is helpful in giving teachers broader ideas as to the working and purpose of his institution and acquaintance with his colleagues. More than a reasonable amount is distinctly detrimental to teaching. It is felt that some allowance in teaching schedules should be made for extension work of important character. Correspondence work, where possible, should be done by teachers other than those employed in regular class work and should be assigned to instructors especially fitted for this type of teaching.
(b) It was felt that allowance in some cases should be made in a teacher's class schedule for unremunerative work closely related to the field of scholarship.
(c) Caution should be used in allowing teachers to engage in remunerative outside employment, but such contacts might be helpful if done in moderation.
6. (a) Not under present conditions. (b) Ditto.
7. Very important.
8. Knowledge of the major problems of higher education can be best gained by general reading, and contact with one's colleagues. Such information may be obtained from magazines like *Harper's*, *Atlantic Monthly*, and from special publications like the American Association of University Professors' *Bulletin*.
9. No experience in this University.
10. The members of the committee who have had experience with the new type tests are not impressed with their efficiency.
11. Division into small sections is certainly desirable for some subjects. In others, little seems to be gained by the use of small classes. Members of the different departments have felt in cases which have come under their observation that sectioning on the basis of ability has proved detrimental rather than helpful.
12. Such methods as tutorial sections, conference plan, honors courses, reading periods, etc., are regarded as interesting experiments and should be encouraged where practicable.

A modified honors course is now in use in the English department and is regarded as of considerable value.

13. (a) The committee is opposed to a standing faculty committee on the improvement of teaching.
- (b) Good, if done informally.
- (c) The committee can see some advantage in a committee on educational research as a means of securing cooperation between the school of education and other schools of the university. It is highly desirable that there should be cooperation of this sort. In the University of Kansas the only committee of this type is the Joint Committee of the School of Education and the College of Liberal Arts on the Administration of the University Teachers' Diploma. The result of cooperation as effected by this committee has been distinctly advantageous to both schools.
- (d) Research projects of this type seem to be of doubtful value.
- (e) The committee is strictly opposed to this.
- (f) Visits from professors whose success is primarily in the field of teaching should probably be encouraged, but their value is dependent upon the particular situation found.

IV. UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE EVALUATION OF COURSES AND INSTRUCTORS BY STUDENTS

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, FACULTY INFORMATION BLANK

You are asked on this blank to give the best possible answer to a number of questions concerning this course. This request does not imply that you are willing to pose as an expert in higher education. It assumes only that you have formed certain impressions of the course from a student's point of view and that you are willing to give your instructor these impressions for his information.

Your instructor will use these facts in any way that his best judgment dictates. They are intended solely for his information and for that of no other person. You will do a real service to your instructor, the university, and the students that follow you in this course, if you answer the questions as frankly and accurately as you possibly can.

You are asked to give your name to make possible research on a number of problems that involve looking up university records. For example, your name will be used in discovering the relation between judgments of a course and general high school and university average. Your name will be held in strictest confidence by those who tabulate the returns.

THE UNIVERSITY PLEDGES THAT NO PERSON WILL KNOW THE IDENTITY OF THE STUDENT WHO GIVES THIS INFORMATION. AFTER ANSWERS HAVE BEEN TABULATED THE BLANKS WILL BE DESTROYED. NO MEMBER OF THE FACULTY WILL SEE THE INDIVIDUAL BLANKS. YOU NEED HAVE NO FEAR OF COMPLETE FRANKNESS.

Your replies will be most valuable if you will keep three suggestions in mind as you answer the questions. The suggestions are:

1. Consider each question entirely apart from the others. Form an independent judgment on each question, forgetting for the moment your answers to the other questions.
2. Check the answer that comes closest to your judgment even if there is no statement that exactly fits your opinion. You can qualify your answer in the space left for remarks.
3. Try to have but one interest, that of giving a true and accurate answer to each individual question.

Course Number	Department	Name of Course	Credits
---------------	------------	----------------	---------

Name of Instructor	Name of Quiz Instructor	Name of Laboratory Instructor
--------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------

No. of hours lecture or recitation . . . No. hours quiz . . . No. hours lab . . .

Year in College in Major
College which enrolled subject

Please write your
name plainly

Indicate your answer to each question by putting a small x to the left of the number that designates it. Limitations of space have made it impossible to provide fine gradations of answers to each question. The purposes of this study will be served if in each case you check the statement that comes closest to your judgment, even though it is only an approximation. You can explain your answer in the space left for comments.

TRY TO FORM AN INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT ON EACH QUESTION. CONSIDER IT ENTIRELY APART FROM THE OTHERS.

A. What was your reason for taking this course?

1. It was required.
2. It was one of a group of which one must be chosen.
3. It was an entirely optional elective.

- () B. Estimate the number of hours per week that you spent in preparation for this course outside the classroom or laboratory. Put that number in the parenthesis to the left of the question. If you are not sure, make the best guess possible.
- C. Has the subject matter of this course overlapped that of any other course that you have taken in the University.
1. This course has been entirely unlike any other course.
 2. It overlapped somewhat another course. (Put the name of the course in the left margin.)
 3. It overlapped another course to a considerable extent. (Put the name of the course in the margin.)
- D. What is your opinion of the quality of the textbook or material assigned for reading?
1. Seemed to be somewhat inferior.
 2. Deficient in some important respects.
 3. Good for the purposes of the course.
 4. Excellent, unusually well adapted to the purposes of the course.
 5. Seemed to be outstandingly superior in every respect.
- E. In what way was your interest in the course influenced by the instructor? Base your judgment on the extent to which the instructor contributed to arousing and developing a mature and wholesome interest in the field covered by the course.
1. The instructor possibly made the course less interesting than most instructors would have done.
 2. The instructor neither added nor detracted greatly from the interest that I felt in the course.
 3. A distinct interest aroused by the instructor.
 4. Instructor unusually successful in arousing interest in the field covered.
 5. The instructor made this one of the two or three most interesting courses I have taken.
- F. To what extent were you interested in the subject matter of the course? Consider only the subject matter, leaving the instructor and his methods of presentation out of account.
1. I was not interested in the subject matter of the course.
 2. The subject matter of the course was of slight interest to me.

3. The subject matter of the course was moderately interesting.
 4. The subject matter of the course was distinctly interesting to me.
 5. The subject matter of the course was of the most intense interest to me.
- G. What is your feeling about the extent to which this course contributed to your education?
1. In general, the course has not seemed to contribute much to my education.
 2. The contribution of the course was such that my time was in general profitably spent.
 3. This course made an important contribution to my education.
 4. A distinctly profitable course from this point of view.
 5. This course made an unusual and outstanding contribution to my education.
- H. What is your opinion of the value to you of the material presented in the lectures? Consider its value in clearing up difficulties, the extent to which it gave information and points of view not available elsewhere, the extent to which it was free from unnecessary repetition of textbook or readings, and the breadth and richness it contributed to the course.
1. Judged by these standards, the material presented in the lectures seemed to me of slight value.
 2. It seemed to me that the material presented in the lectures was somewhat deficient in these respects.
 3. Judging by these standards it was profitable to me.
 4. The lecture material was unusually valuable judged by these standards.
 5. The lecture material was to the highest degree valuable as judged by these standards.
- I. How well adjusted to you was the amount of assigned work?
1. Required far more outside work than I could assimilate.
 2. Covered somewhat too much outside work for me to assimilate.
 3. The amount of outside work was well adjusted to me.
 4. I could have handled somewhat more outside work than was assigned.

5. The amount of outside work assigned was considerably below my capacities.
- J. What is your impression of the relative amounts of lecture and discussion?
1. The instructor lectured far too much and gave too little opportunity for discussion.
 2. The class would probably have been more profitable if there had been less lecturing and more discussion.
 3. A good balance was struck between lectures and discussion.
 4. The class would probably have been more profitable if there had been somewhat more lecturing and less class discussion.
 5. There was far too much class discussion and not enough lecturing to make the class most profitable.
- K. To what extent was the course well adjusted to your ability?
1. It assumed a maturity and preparation that I did not possess. It was much over my head.
 2. To some extent it assumed more maturity and preparation than I possessed.
 3. It was well adjusted to my maturity and previous preparation.
 4. The materials of the course seemed somewhat too simple and elementary for me.
 5. The course was much too simple and elementary for me.
- L. To what extent were you stimulated to independent thinking in so far as it was possible in this course? Contrast emphasis upon rote memorizing with emphasis upon the thoughtful use of information.
1. The predominant stress was on memorizing of lectures or text.
 2. Some original thinking was provoked, but it was not stressed.
 3. I was stimulated to think for myself and encouraged to do it.
 4. Original thinking was strongly stressed and I was much stimulated to do it.
 5. I received unusual stimulation and encouragement to original thinking.

M. What is your impression of the general effectiveness with which the instructor conducted this course? Try to average up all the factors that make for capable teaching and to strike a general balance. So far as possible, leave out of account the subject matter of the course and consider only the instructor. Make the best answer that you can, realizing that any judgment must be highly subjective.

1. In my opinion, not a successful teacher with this course.
2. Slightly deficient as a teacher in some respects, in my opinion.
3. In my opinion, a thoroughly capable and successful teacher with this course.
4. Unusually capable and successful as a teacher.
5. Outstanding in every significant respect. Approaches my ideal of the perfect teacher.

N. What is your impression of the general quality of the course content? Take into account so far as you can the quality of the material presented in readings, lectures, and laboratory, the extent to which it is of college calibre, and any other factors that seem to you to be important in determining the quality of materials offered in a college course. Try to base your judgment wholly on the course material, leaving the instructor out of account.

1. This course seemed to me somewhat deficient in respect to the qualities suggested.
2. Seemed to me a fair course in respect to the qualities suggested.
3. In these respects a good college course.
4. In these respects a distinctly superior course.
5. In every significant respect the course seemed of the highest quality to me.

Show your opinion on the following topics by placing a check mark (V) on the accompanying line at the point that seems to you to be correct. In considering a topic read first the general statement and then the phrases that describe the various degrees. The check mark may be placed directly above the words or along the line between them as you deem proper. Thus you can show any gradation that you wish. Ignore the dots on the lines.

O. Presentation of
subject matter.

Unusually clear and
well organized.

Clear and well
organized.

At times somewhat
muddled or un-
systematic.

P. Stimulation of lectures to thinking.	They were distinctly thought provoking.	Moderately thought provoking.	Lectures aroused very little mental activity.
Q. Tolerance with disagreement.	Encourages us to state thoughtful disagreements.	Welcomes thoughtful differences of opinion.	Instructor primarily interested in stating his own views.
R. Stress on topics.	Emphasis on a topic carefully adjusted to its importance.	As a rule stress seemed well placed.	Details are sometimes stressed to the neglect of important topics.
S. Interest of the instructor in teaching.	The enthusiasm of the instructor aroused great interest and enthusiasm.	Much contagious enthusiasm and interest.	Instructor shows a moderate interest in teaching.
T. Feeling between instructor and students.	An unusual feeling of good will predominates.	Good feeling but not unusually so.	Sometimes a slight tendency to strained relations.
U. Answer this question if there were class discussions.	Instructor unusually successful in eliciting and directing discussions of high quality.	I felt that the discussions were of good quality.	The discussions tended to be somewhat trivial.
V. Stress in examinations.	Examinations perfectly balanced in stress on major and minor topics.	In general importance of a topic determines stress put on it.	Details are sometimes overstressed.

On this sheet you are asked to give any additional information that you believe should be in the possession of your instructor. Note what you consider the outstanding merits of the course and methods of instruction. If there are defects of any kind tell what they are. Make any suggestions that you believe might result in bettering the course. It might be well to glance over the questions you have just answered for suggestions.

Unless you prefer otherwise this sheet will be detached and sent to your instructor. If you do not wish this sheet of comments sent to the instructor put a cross in the upper right corner of this page. In that case a typed copy of the comments will be sent and this sheet will be destroyed.

V. UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

A SELF-RATING SCALE FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS

The Committee on the Improvement of College Teaching submits to the teaching staff of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences the following rating scale for individual use.

The Committee believes that this rating scale embraces most of the problems confronting the college teacher, and that conscientious use

of this scale will prove invaluable in raising the standard of efficiency in college teaching in general.

Attention to light and ventilation	Careful	Sometimes negligent	Negligent
Beginning recitations	Punctual	Irregular	Habitually tardy
Closing recitations	Punctual	Irregular	Early Late
Personal appearance	Good (well-groomed)	Average	Untidy
Personal peculiarities	No mannerisms	Few or frequent mannerisms	Many or constant mannerisms
Sense of humor	Well balanced	Mediumly balanced	Over serious Frivolous
Expression of thought	A		
	Fluent	Hesitant	Difficult
	B		
	Accurate	Inaccurate	
	C		
	Always clear	Sometimes vague	Always vague
Daily lesson preparation	Carefully and fully prepared	Usually somewhat prepared	Often unprepared
Organization of course	Thorough	Adequate	Slightly inadequate Poor
	Complete (written syllabus)		Developed during semester
Presentation of subject	Definite and forceful	Sometimes mechanical	Involved Monotonous
Interest in subject	Intense	Mild	Indifferent
Knowledge of subject	Thorough	Medium	Limited
Knowledge of related subject	Extensive	Limited	Insufficient
Relation of discussion to subject	Complete and effective	Sometimes ineffective	Poor
Success in arousing student interest	Attained with ease	Attained with difficulty	Unattained
	Attained to a high degree	Attained to a medium degree	Attained to a slight degree

Success in directing
discussions

A. Degree

Excellent	Adequate	Meager	Slight	Poor due to lack of en- couragement
-----------	----------	--------	--------	-------------------------------------------

B. Merits

Worthwhile	Confusion (resulting from rambling questions)
------------	--------------------------------------------------

Attitude toward
students

Always helpful	Impersonal	Suspicious
----------------	------------	------------

Friendly	Tolerant	Familiar
----------	----------	----------

Reaction to viewpoints
of others

Encouraging	Considerate	Intolerant
-------------	-------------	------------

Requirement of student
thinking

Extensive	Medium	Slight
-----------	--------	--------

Amount of work
required

Reasonable	Excessive	Unreasonable
------------	-----------	--------------

Sufficient	Insufficient	Little
------------	--------------	--------

Student response

A. Recitation:

1. Invited

Much	Little	None
------	--------	------

2. Uninvited

Much	Little	None
------	--------	------

3. Students partici-
pating (not neces-
sarily daily—with-
in reasonable time)

All	More than half	Fewer than half
-----	----------------	-----------------

B. Preparation:

1. Regularity

Consistent	Inconsistent
------------	--------------

2. Completeness

Attained	Partially attained	Meagerly attained
----------	--------------------	-------------------

3. Quality

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
-----------	------	------	------

4. Students partici-
pating

All	More than half	Fewer than half
-----	----------------	-----------------

Knowledge of student
progress

A. Degree:

Thorough	Medium	Slight
----------	--------	--------

B. Manner of Acquiring:

Frequent checks	Occasional checks	Few checks	No checks
--------------------	----------------------	------------	-----------

Accessible for consulta-
tion

Regularly	Seldom	Never
-----------	--------	-------

Grading

A. Basis:

Both content
and form

Form

Content

B. Method:

Objective

Subjective

Attitude in grading

Impartial

Occasionally
partialConstantly
partial

LABORATORY SUPPLEMENT

Laboratory directions
(printed)Clear and
definiteNot
uniform

Vague

Confusing

Correlation of labora-
tory and recitation
programs (except in
independent schedule)

Well correlated

Vaguely correlated

Totally uncorre-
lated

Supervision of work

Adequate super-
visionImproper super-
vision (experiment
frequently inter-
rupted)

No supervision

Interference by other
students

No interference

Occasional
interferenceConstant
interference

VI. BRIEF LIST OF BOOKS ON PROBLEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Brooks, R. C., *Reading for Honors at Swarthmore*. A record of the first five years, 1922-1927. Oxford University Press: New York, 1927.

Burton, E. D., *Education in a Democratic World*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1927.

Eurich, A. C., editor, *The Changing Educational World, 1905-1930*. University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 1931.

Federal Relations to Education: Committee Findings and Recommendations. Report of the National Advisory Committee on Education, Part I. Washington: National Advisory Committee on Education (744 Jackson Place), 1931.

Flexner, Abraham, *Universities: American English German*. Oxford University Press: New York, 1930. 381 pp.

Good, Carter V., *Teaching in College and University*. A survey of the problems and literature in higher education. Warwick and York: Baltimore, 1929.

Gray, William S., editor, *The Training of College Teachers, Including Their Preliminary Preparation and In-Service Improvement*. (Proceed-

ings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, 1930. Vol. II.) University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1930. 242 pp.

Gray, William S., editor, *Recent Trends in American College Education*. (Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, 1931. Vol. III.) University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1931. 253 pp.

Gray, William S., editor, *Provision for the Individual in College Education*. (Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, 1932. Vol. IV.) University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1932.

Harper, William R., *The Trend in Higher Education*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1905.

Hudelson, Earl, editor, *Problems of College Education*. Studies in Administration, Student Personnel, Curriculum, and Instruction. University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 1928. 449 pp.

Johnston, J. B., *The Liberal College in Changing Society*. Century: New York, 1930. 326 pp.

Jones, E. S., *Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges*, Macmillan Co.: New York, 1933.

Judd, Charles H., *Problems of Education in the United States*. Recent Social Trends Monograph. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1933.

Kelly, R. L., *The Effective College*. Association of American Colleges: 111 Fifth Ave., New York, 1928.

Kent, Raymond A., editor, *Higher Education in America*. Ginn & Co.: Boston, 1930. 689 pp.

Koos, L. V., *The Junior-College Movement*. Ginn & Co.: Boston, 1925.

Martin, Everett, *The Meaning of a Liberal Education*. W. W. Norton and Co.: New York, 1926.

Meiklejohn, A., *The Experimental College*. Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1932.

National Society of College Teachers of Education, *Current Educational Readjustments in Institutions of Higher Learning*. Yearbook XVII. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1929. 179 pp.

National Society of College Teachers of Education, *Quantitative Measurement in Institutions of Higher Learning*. Yearbook XVIII. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1930. 253 pp.

National Society for the Study of Education, 31st Yearbook, Part II. *Changes and Experiments in Liberal Arts Education*. Prepared by Kathryn McHale, Director of the American Association of University Women's Coöperative Study. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1932. 510 pp. Cloth, \$2.50; paper, \$1.75.

New York University Conference of Universities: Proceedings published as *The Obligation of Universities to the Social Order*. New York University Press, 1933. 503 pp.

Reeves, Floyd W.; Russell, John Dale; Gregg, H. C.; Brumbaugh, A. J.; and Blauch, L. E., *The Liberal Arts College*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1932.

Richardson, Leon B., *A Study of the Liberal College*. A report to the President of Dartmouth College. Hanover, New Hampshire, 1924.

Schilpp, P. A., editor, *Higher Education Faces the Future*. A symposium on College and University Education in the U. S. Liveright: New York, 1930.

Wilkins, E. H., *The Changing College*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1927.

It is appreciated that many college teachers will be primarily interested in books and journals dealing with the problems of their own subjects or closely related fields. It seems impracticable for the committee to include specialized lists of such material, but it is hoped that the need will be met through other channels.

Educational journals which will prove useful to those who desire an acquaintance with the latest developments in the field of higher education are: *School and Society*, *The Educational Record*, *The Journal of Higher Education*, the *North Central Association Quarterly*, the *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges*, and the *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*.

VOLUME XIX

OCTOBER, 1933

NUMBER 6

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING
PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER 29, 30
FELLOWSHIPS
ACADEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT AND RELIEF
EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: JOSEPH ALLEN; PAUL KAUFMAN;
JOSEPH MAYER; H. W. TYLER, *Chairman*.

Publication Office: 20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

Editorial Office: 744 JACKSON PLACE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September.

Entered as Second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at
Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

New York University Conference of Universities: Proceedings published as *The Obligation of Universities to the Social Order*. New York University Press, 1933. 503 pp.

Reeves, Floyd W.; Russell, John Dale; Gregg, H. C.; Brumbaugh, A. J.; and Blauch, L. E., *The Liberal Arts College*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1932.

Richardson, Leon B., *A Study of the Liberal College*. A report to the President of Dartmouth College. Hanover, New Hampshire, 1924.

Schilpp, P. A., editor, *Higher Education Faces the Future*. A symposium on College and University Education in the U. S. Liveright: New York, 1930.

Wilkins, E. H., *The Changing College*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1927.

It is appreciated that many college teachers will be primarily interested in books and journals dealing with the problems of their own subjects or closely related fields. It seems impracticable for the committee to include specialized lists of such material, but it is hoped that the need will be met through other channels.

Educational journals which will prove useful to those who desire an acquaintance with the latest developments in the field of higher education are: *School and Society*, *The Educational Record*, *The Journal of Higher Education*, the *North Central Association Quarterly*, the *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges*, and the *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*.